SPEECH

OF THE

RIGHT HONORABLE

JOHN FOSTER,

SPEAKER

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS OF IRELAND,

DELIVERED IN COMMITTEE,

ON *THURSDAY* THE 11TH DAY OF *APRIL*, 1799.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED BY JAMES MOORE, NO. 45, COLLEGE-GREEN.

1799.

17
53
SEP

SPEECH,

&c. &c.

Mr. ROCHFORT,

THE noble Lord, when he declared his aſſent to the Bill's going into a Committee, has ſpoken of it as part of a ſyſtem, and dwelt upon the neceſſity of a Union, as the only means of effecting the purpoſe of the bill, and the reſt of the ſyſtem. He has connected the ſubject of a Legiſlative Union ſo much with it, and enlarged ſo amply upon it, that I feel myſelf juſtified in following him. He has gone into the connexion between the two kingdoms, and ſtated the conſtitution of 1782 as the ſource from whence the evils he affects to apprehend, and the remedy, of a Union he propoſes, flowed. I will go therefore through the whole of the ſubject, and if I treſpaſs on the patience of the Houſe, which I much fear, from the little practice I have been in for years, of ſpeaking in public, I ſhall have much reaſon to entreat their indulgence.

In diſcuſſing the ſubject, I muſt often allude to a ſpeech publiſhed as Mr. Pitt's, and as various editions of it have been circulated, I ſhall ſelect that to which the Government has given the ſanction of its authority,

the one printed by the King's Printer, under their direction, of which 10,000 copies have been circulated gratis by them, and all of which have been paid for at the public expence.

It is certainly a very flattering compliment, that on ſo great a ſubject, on which the Miniſter ſpoke for hours, he ſhould have employed a great portion of his time in endeavouring to borrow argument and authority from ſpeeches ſaid to have been made by me ſo long ago as 1785, and that he ſhould occupy ſo much of the attention of the Britiſh Senate in obſerving on the conduct or opinion of an individual.

The noble Lord has quoted the ſpeech of Mr. Fox as an hiſtorical document, and has told you that the addreſſes of Parliament, and the ſpeeches of Lord Lieutenants, are not to be relied on. He is the firſt Secretary who has ever preſumed to make ſuch an aſſertion, who has ever publicly advanced, that what the Commons ſay to his Majeſty, and what his Majeſty's Viceroy ſays to them, is meer matter of form, not to be relied on, but that a caſual, unauthoriſed publication of a Mr. Debrett is a genuine document. He has alſo uſed an expreſſion, ſuch a one as I never heard in this Houſe, either before or ſince the ſettlement of 1782; the noble Lord has ſaid, (and if I am wrong, he will correct me, I do not wiſh to miſtate any man, much leſs the noble Lord, for whom I have always had the higheſt reſpect,) that the evils he mentioned aroſe out of the ſettlement of 1782, becauſe until then this kingdom *acknowledged* the power in the Britiſh Parliament to bind Ireland.

Lord

Lord CASTLEREAGH—I did not mean to ſay, *acknowledged*, but that before the adjuſtment of 1782, this Country was in the *habit of paying obedience* to that power.

SPEAKER.—The noble Lord copies his brother miniſter in ambiguity of expreſſion, as well as in all his poſitions; the miniſter ſays, what *puts an end* to any thing is not *final*, and his Lordſhip tells us, that *paying obedience to a power* is not *an acknowledgment of that power*.

I will enter into the ſettlement of 1782: the meaſures of that year aroſe out of our diſavowal of that very power. Our denial of the Britiſh claim gave riſe to the glorious ſettlement of 1782, it removed all thoſe evils which this project of a Union would again heap upon this kingdom, and when the Britiſh Miniſter wants us to give up that Conſtitution which was then confirmed to us, it is no wonder he ſhould apply all his endeavours to explain it away, as it and his Union are wholly incompatible with each other. His arguments, indeed, (if they deſerve that name) are matter of ſurpriſe, for they either reſt on miſ-recollection of facts, or ſo far from being born up by the authorities he refers to, are clearly and incontrovertibly overturned by them. He ſays, he will prove his aſſertion, that no final adjuſtment was then made, by the recorded opinions of the Britiſh Parliament expreſſed at the time, and by the opinions of the then Government and Miniſters, all of which you will preſently ſee, prove the contrary,—but why did he not refer alſo to the opinions of the Iriſh Parliament and Iriſh miniſters, whoſe concern it more immediately was, and whoſe declarations were explicit? Are we to ſuppoſe they eſcaped his notice, and that he entirely forgot that the Country which demanded

redreſs

redreſs for its Conſtitution, beſt knew how to deem the adjuſtment of it, final and complete? or that he knew he would find at every ſtep a direct refutation of his aſſertions?

Before I examine theſe opinions, it will be neceſſary that I ſhould ſtate the origin of that ſettlement, in order that the whole may be perfectly underſtood.

'Ireland had for a long ſeries of time,' to uſe Mr. Pitt's words, 'felt the narrow policy of Great Britain, who, in-'fluenced by views of trade and commercial advantage, and 'tainted and perverted with ſelfiſh motives, had treated her 'with partiality and neglect, and never looked upon her 'growth and proſperity as the growth and proſperity of 'the Empire at large.' It is unneceſſary to dwell on the circumſtances of the times, or any other cauſe, which enabled Ireland at laſt to ſpeak out with effect, but the fact is, that in 1782, her grievances reached the Throne, and on the 9th of April, in that year, Mr. Fox delivered a Meſſage to the Britiſh Commons, from his Majeſty, 'That his Majeſty, being concerned to find that diſcon-'tents and jealouſies are prevailing among his loyal 'ſubjects in Ireland, upon matters of great weight and 'importance, he earneſtly recommends to this Houſe to 'take the ſame into conſideration, in order to ſuch *a final* '*adjuſtment* as may give mutual ſatisfaction to both 'kingdoms." The Iriſh Parliament at this time ſtood adjourned to the 16th of April, on which day ſimilar Meſſages were delivered to both Houſes here, each of whom inſtantly voted an Addreſs to his Majeſty, both correſponding exactly in ſubſtance, I will therefore detail only the one preſented by the Commons.

It went 'to aſſure his Majeſty of our unſhaken attachment to his Majeſty's perſon and government, and of our lively ſenſe of his paternal care, in thus taking the lead to adminiſter content to his Majeſty's ſubjects of Ireland; That, thus encouraged by his royal interpoſition, we ſhall beg leave, with all duty and affection, to lay before his Majeſty the cauſes of our diſcontents and jealouſies; to aſſure his Majeſty that his ſubjects of Ireland are a free people; that the Crown of Ireland is an Imperial Crown, inſeparably annexed to the Crown of Great Britain, on which connexion the intereſts and happineſs of both nations eſſentially depend; but that the kingdom of Ireland is a diſtinct kingdom, with a Parliament of her own, the ſole Legiſlature thereof; that there is no body of men competent to make laws to bind this nation, except the King, Lords and Commons of Ireland, nor any other Parliament which hath any authority or power, of any ſort whatſoever, in this country, ſave only the Parliament of Ireland; to aſſure his Majeſty that we humbly conceive, that in this right the very eſſence of our liberties exiſt; a right which we, on the part of all the people of Ireland, do claim as their birth-right, and which we cannot yield but with our lives.' Are theſe words—empty ſounds without meaning—as the noble Lord inſinuates? Did we involve our lives and fortunes without meaning? Did we claim our birth-right without meaning? The Addreſs goes on, 'To aſſure his Majeſty that we have ſeen, with concern, certain claims advanced by the Parliament of Great Britain, in an Act, entitled an Act, for the better ſecuring the Dependency of Ireland; an Act containing matter entirely irreconcileable to the fundamental rights of this nation: that we conceive this Act, and the claims it advances, to be the great and principal cauſe of the diſcontents and jealouſies

'louſies

'louſies in this kingdom.' Now, Sir, what was this Act of Dependency, but in its eſſence, in its practical effects, the very Union which is now recommended, nay, this Union is ſtill worſe, for while Ireland retains a Parliament, ſhe has the means of redreſs; but the meaſure propoſed by the noble Lord goes expreſsly to take away for ever thoſe means. The Addreſs proceeds, 'To aſſure 'his Majeſty, that his Majeſty's Commons of Ireland 'do moſt ſincerely wiſh, that all Bills which become 'law in Ireland, ſhould receive the approbation of his 'Majeſty, under the Seal of Great Britain; but that 'yet we do conſider the practice of ſuppreſſing our 'Bills in the Council of Ireland, or altering the ſame 'any where, to be another juſt cauſe of diſcontent 'and jealouſy;—To aſſure his Majeſty, that an Act, 'intitled an Act for the better accommodation of his 'Majeſty's forces, being unlimited in duration, and 'defective in other inſtances, but paſſed in that ſhape 'from the particular circumſtances of the times, is another 'juſt cauſe of diſcontent and jealouſy in this kingdom. 'That we have ſubmitted theſe, the principal cauſes of 'the preſent diſcontent and jealouſy of Ireland, and re'main in humble expectation of redreſs,—that we have 'the greateſt reliance on his Majeſty's wiſdom, the moſt 'ſanguine expectations from his virtuous choice of a Chief 'Governor, and great confidence in the wiſe, auſpicious, 'and conſtitutional councils, which we ſee with ſatisfac'tion his Majeſty has adopted: That we have moreover a 'high ſenſe and veneration for the Britiſh character, and 'do therefore conceive, that the proceedings of this coun'try, founded as they were in right, and tempered by 'duty, muſt have excited the approbation and eſteem, 'inſtead, of wounding the pride, of the Britiſh nation; 'and we beg leave to aſſure his Majeſty, that we are the

'more

'more confirmed in this hope, in as much as the people 'of this kingdom have never expreſſed a deſire to ſhare 'the freedom of England, without declaring a determi-'nation to ſhare her fate likewiſe, ſtanding and falling 'with the Britiſh Nation.'

You will obſerve in this Addreſs that four objects, and four only, are pointed out as the grievances, the removal of which is deſired, and that they are all *conſtitutional*—Britain's claim to bind Ireland—the Appellant Juriſdiction—Poyning's Law—and the Perpetuity of the Mutiny Bill. In truth, we, who were in Parliament at the time, know that as the freedom of trade was demanded, and acceded to in 1780, and a free intercourſe with the colonies confirmed, what remained for *commercial* regulation, or even for attainment, was not then in contemplation.

This addreſs from the Iriſh Commons, together with a ſimilar one from the Iriſh Lords, was laid before both Houſes in Great Britain, who had not proceeded on his Majeſty's Meſſage, waiting I ſuppoſe to know the ſenſe of the Iriſh Parliament—and they came to a reſolution on the 17th of May, which I ſhall mention preſently, and which was laid before the Iriſh Parliament, on the 27th of the ſame month, by the Duke of Portland's order, when he made the following Speech from the Throne:—

'My Lords and Gentlemen,

'It gives me the utmoſt ſatisfaction that the firſt time 'I have occaſion to addreſs you, I find myſelf enabled 'by the magnanimity of the King, and the wiſdom of 'the Parliament of Great Britain, to aſſure you that im-

'mediate

'mediate attention has been paid to your repreſentations, 'and that the Britiſh Legiſlature, have concurred in a 'reſolution to remove the cauſes of your diſcontents and 'jealouſies, and are united in a deſire to gratify every 'wiſh expreſſed in your late addreſſes to the Throne.

'By the papers [meaning the reſolutions of the Britiſh 'Houſes] which in obedience to his Majeſty's commands 'I have directed to be laid before you—you will re-'ceive the moſt convincing teſtimony of the cordial re-'ception which your repreſentations have met with from 'the Legiſlature of Great Britain. But his Majeſty, 'whoſe firſt and moſt anxious wiſh is to exerciſe his royal 'prerogative in ſuch manner as may be moſt conducive to 'the welfare of all his faithful ſubjects, has further given 'it me in command, to aſſure you of his gracious diſ-'poſition to give his royal aſſent to acts to prevent the 'ſuppreſſion of bills in the Privy Council of this king-'dom, and the alteration of them any where, and to limit 'the duration of the act for the better regulation and 'accommodation of his Majeſty's Forces in this kingdom, 'to the term of two years.

'Theſe benevolent intentions of his Majeſty, and the 'willingneſs of his Parliament of Great Britian, to ſe-'cond his gracious purpoſes, are unaccompanied by any 'ſtipulation or condition whatever; the good faith, the 'generoſity, the honor of this nation afford them the 'ſureſt pledge of a correſponding diſpoſition on your 'part, to promote and perpetuate the harmony, the ſta-'bility and the glory of the Empire. On my own part 'I entertain not the leaſt doubt but that the ſame 'ſpirit which urged you to ſhare the freedom of 'Great Britain, will confirm you in your determination

'to

'to ſhare her fate alſo, ſtanding or falling with the Britiſh 'Nation.'

An Addreſs was returned next day by the Commons in which they ſay, 'That we feel moſt ſenſibly the atten-'tion which our repreſentations have received from the 'magnanimity of your Majeſty, and the wiſdom of the 'Parliament of Great Britain.

'We aſſure your Majeſty, that we conceive the reſolu-'tion for an unqualified, unconditional repeal of the '6th of George the firſt, to be a meaſure of conſum-'mate wiſdom and juſtice, ſuitable to the dignity and 'eminence of both nations, exalting the character of both, 'and *furniſhing a perpetual pledge of mutual amity.*

'We aſſure your Majeſty, that we are ſenſibly affect-'ed by your virtuous determination to accede to the 'wiſhes of your faithful people, and to exerciſe your royal 'prerogative in a manner moſt conducive to their welfare, 'and accordingly we ſhall immediately prepare bills to 'carry into execution the deſires of your Majeſty's peo-'ple, and your own benevolent purpoſes.

'Gratified in thoſe particulars we do aſſure your Ma-'jeſty, that *no conſtitutional queſtion between the two nations 'will any longer exiſt, which can interrupt their harmony*; and 'that Great Britain, as ſhe has approved of our firmneſs, 'ſo ſhe may rely on our affection.

'We remember, and do repeat, our determination to 'ſtand, and fall, with the Britiſh Nation.

'We perceive with pleaſure the magnanimity of your 'Majeſty, diſclaim the little policy of making a bargain

'with your people, and feeling with pride the confidence 'your Majeſty repoſes in the good faith, generoſity and 'honor of the Iriſh Nation, we anſwer with all humility, 'that your Majeſty entertains a juſt ſenſe of our charac- 'ter. Common intereſt, perpetual connection, the recent 'conduct of Great Britain, a native affection to the Bri- 'tiſh name and nation, together with the conſtitution 'which we have recovered, and the high reputation 'we poſſeſs, muſt ever decide the wiſhes as well as the 'intereſt of Ireland, to *perpetuate the harmony, ſtability and* '*glory of the Empire.*'

This Addreſs received a ſlight oppoſition, and very fortunately, becauſe a diviſion took place, which ſhews not only the decided ſenſe of the Iriſh Commons, but that the Houſe which expreſſed that ſenſe was uncommonly full.—The ayes were 211—the noes *none*, there being only the tellers.

On the ſame day the Commons alſo addreſſed the Lord Lieutenant, and among other things they ſaid, 'We 'cannot but rejoice that the name of Portland, ſo intimate- 'ly connected with the great æra of Britiſh liberty will 'be handed down to the lateſt poſterity inſeparably 'blended with *the full and perfect eſtabliſhment of the Con-* '*ſtitution of Ireland.*'

I ſhould here obſerve, that his Majeſty's anſwer to their firſt addreſs of April, which had arrived during the receſs, was not preſented until the next day, being the 28th, and is in ſubſtance as follows:

'It gives his Majeſty the higheſt ſatisfaction to obſerve, 'that in their opinion, in which his Majeſty perfectly 'concurs,

'concurs, the *conſtitutional connexion between Great Britain 'and Ireland is eſſential to the intereſts and happineſs of both 'nations*, and that it is the determination of his people of 'Ireland, to ſhare the fate of, and to ſtand and fall with, 'the Britiſh nation.

'His Majeſty conceives that theſe principles cannot fail 'to contribute to the *accompliſhment* of his earneſt deſire to 'remove all cauſe of diſcontent and jealouſy; with that 'view his Majeſty has recommended this weighty and 'important ſubject to the conſideration of his parliaments 'of both kingdoms, truſting that their united wiſdom will 'ſuggeſt ſuch meaſures as may terminate in a *final adjuſt-'ment* to their mutual ſatisfaction. With the ſame view 'his Majeſty intends forthwith to communicate to the 'Lords and Commons of Great Britain the addreſſes of 'the Lords and Commons of Ireland.'

His anſwer to the latter addreſs of the 27th of May, did not arrive until the 13th of June: in it he ſays, 'He has 'received with the moſt ſincere ſatisfaction the dutiful 'and loyal Addreſs of his Houſe of Commons of Ire-'land—his Majeſty aſſures his faithful Commons, of his 'affectionate acceptance of their grateful acknowledg-'ments for the attention which his Majeſty and the Par-'liament of Great Britain have ſhewn to their repreſen-'tations, and which they ſo juſtly conſider as *furniſhing a 'perpetual pledge of mutual amity.*'

The declarations of the Houſe of Commons, 'that *no 'conſtitutional queſtion between the two nations will any longer 'exiſt that can interrupt their harmony*, and that Great Bri-'tain may rely on their affections, are very pleaſing to his 'Majeſty.

'His

'His Majeſty is fully convinced, by their preſent pro-
'feſſions of entire ſatisfaction and dutiful attachment,
'that his Majeſty always entertained a juſt ſenſe of their
'character. *The zeal which they have ſhewn to perpetuate*
'*the harmony, and their determinations to uphold the glory,*
'*of the Empire,* juſtify his Majeſty for having on his part
'given the moſt unequivocal proofs of his royal confi-
'dence in the honour and good faith of the Iriſh Na-
'tion.'

You will keep in mind that in this Anſwer, his Majeſty omits any expreſſion recommending *final adjuſtment*, which he mentioned in his firſt Meſſage, and repeated in his anſwer to the firſt Addreſs, becauſe I ſhall have occaſion to call it to your recollection.

After this the Seſſion drew to a cloſe, and it was in thoſe days the cuſtom to addreſs the Lord Lieutenant, previous to the prorogation, as a compliment, and as a review of the material objects of the Seſſion; accordingly, the Commons, in their Addreſs to the Duke of Portland, on the 23d of July, ſay:

'At the cloſe of this ſeſſion we ſhall have ſeen under
'your Grace's adminiſtration, the Judges rendered inde-
'pendent of the Crown; the law for the puniſhment of
'mutiny and deſertion, abridged in duration, and ſo alter-
'ed as to become a vindication of the conſtitution; the
'juriſdiction of the hereditary Judges of the land reſtored;
'the vicious mode of paſſing laws, which was heretofore
'exerciſed in this country, reformed; and the ſole and ex-
'cluſive right of Legiſlation external as well as internal,
'in the Iriſh Parliament, firmly aſſerted on the part of
'Ireland, and unequivocally acknowledged on the part of
'Great

'Great Britain. We ſhall have ſeen this great national 'arrangement eſtabliſhed on a baſis which ſecures the tranquili-'ty of Ireland, and unites the affections as well as intereſts of 'both kingdoms. When we conſider how long we had 'been labouring for thoſe great and important objects, 'and that they have been *accompliſhed* in the ſhort period 'of your Grace's Adminiſtration, we ſhould be wanting, 'in juſtice to your Grace, if we did not acknowledge 'your virtue.'

The Lord Lieutenant's ſpeech with which he concluded the Seſſion, ſoon followed, and his Grace's words deſerve to be moſt particularly attended to, for language more emphatic could not be uſed.

'Many and great national objects muſt preſent them-'ſelves to your conſideration during the receſs from par-'liamentary buſineſs, but what I would moſt earneſtly 'preſs upon you, as that on which your domeſtic peace 'and happineſs, and the proſperity of the empire at this 'moment moſt immediately depend, is to cultivate and 'diffuſe thoſe ſentiments of affection and confidence which 'are now happily reſtored between the two kingdoms. '*Convince the people in your ſeveral diſtricts, as you are your-'ſelves convinced, that every cauſe of paſt jealouſies and diſcon-'tents is finally removed*, that *both countries have pledged their 'good faith to each other*, and that *their beſt ſecurity will be 'an inviolable adherance to that compact*, that the implicit 'reliance which Great Britain has repoſed on the honor, 'generoſity, and candor of Ireland, engages your 'national character to a return of ſentiments equally li-'beral and enlarged, convince them *that the two kingdoms 'are now one, indiſſolubly connected in unity of conſtitution*, and '*unity of intereſts*, that the danger and ſecurity, the proſ-

'perity

'perity and calamity of the one, muſt equally effect the 'other, and they ſtand and fall together.'

I have omitted to ſtate in its proper place as to time, that on a difference of opinion happening as to the ſufficiency of the repeal of 6 Geo. 1. to ſecure the Independance of the Iriſh Parliament, Mr. Flood moved for leave to bring in heads of a bill to declare the ſole and excluſive right of the Iriſh Parliament to make laws in all caſes whatever internal and external for the kingdom of Ireland, which was refuſed, and a reſolution was moved, that leave was refuſed to bring in ſaid heads of a bill, becauſe the ſole ſeparate and excluſive right of legiſlation in the Iriſh Parliament in all caſes whether internal or external had been already aſſerted by Ireland, and fully, *finally*, and irrevocably acknowledged by the Britiſh Parliament. The word *finally* was objected to, and a motion made to expunge it, but on the queſtion being put, it was retained without a diviſion, and the reſolution agreed to.

But I will now give you a ſtronger record than any I have produced, to prove not only the ſenſe of the nation as to the *final* accompliſhment, but as to the ineſtimable value of the ſettlement. On the 30th of May, being the ſecond day after our Addreſs declaring our entire ſatisfaction, and that no conſtitutional queſtion could ever after exiſt between the two kingdoms to interrupt their harmony, an Addreſs was agreed to by both houſes, 'to repreſent to his Majeſty, that they 'were ſo impreſſed with ſentiments of gratitude to Di-'vine Providence, for the many bleſſings beſtowed of 'late on this kingdom, and *particularly for that union, 'harmony, and cordial affection which now happily ſubſiſts 'between his two kingdoms, whoſe intereſts are inſeparebly 'the ſame*, and for the great and ſignal ſucceſs of his 'Majeſty's

'Majeſty's Arms in the Eaſt and Weſt Indies;—that 'they had the moſt ſincere and ardent diſpoſition to ex-'preſs their unfeigned thanks to Almighty God, for theſe 'his mercies to both kingdoms, and that whenever his 'Majeſty ſhall pleaſe to appoint a day of Public Thankſ-'giving, there will not, as they conceive, be any one 'perſon throughout the nation, who will not moſt cor-'dially and ſincerely join in the religious obſervation 'thereof.'

Thus did the nation call on Almighty God to receive their ſolemn thanks for his bleſſings to both kingdoms, in the accompliſhment of this final adjuſtment, and yet this is the ſettlement Mr. Pitt has the hardineſs to tell you, is not *final*, and this is the conſtitution he wants to delude, to threaten, or to force you, into a miſerable and abject ſurrender of.—Can he, can you, can any of us who offered our Thankſgivings on that day, and invoked the Almighty Diſpenſer of the fate of Nations to receive the overflowing effuſions of a kingdom's gratitude, think ſo lightly of what we then acknowledged ſo ſacred, as wantonly and fooliſhly to change thoſe ſolemn ſentiments, and demoliſh the object of a nation's Prayer, and of a nation's Thanks, for the ſpeculative theory or idle declamation of any Miniſter, however great his talents, his integrity, or his power.

It would be needleſs to recur to the ſeveral arguments, or rather aſſertions, uſed by Mr. Pitt, reſpecting the point of final adjuſtment—all who hear me I am ſure muſt be of opinion with me, that never was there yet a great ſpeech made by a great man, which contained ſo little matter; and if any thing could make me believe that the noble Lord poſſeſſes leſs good ſenſe and political talents than I am diſpoſed to aſcribe to him, it is the pains which

which he has taken to diſſeminate in this country ſuch a paltry production. I ſee the gentlemen are taking down my words,—let them do ſo—I will repeat them—a paltry production—paltry, not in regard to the Gentleman that made it, who is certainly entitled to the higheſt reſpect, but paltry in regard to argument, for it is the mereſt tiſſue of general aſſertion without proof, high-flowing language without meaning, and aſſumptions without argument, that I ever read.

We will now go to the proceedings in Great Britain; I have mentioned that his Majeſty ſent a meſſage to the Britiſh Houſes, on the 9th April, which they did not then take into conſideration. The Lord Lieutenant's meſſage which was ſimilar to his Majeſty's, and the Iriſh Addreſſes of 17th April to the King, were delivered by his Majeſty's order to both the Britiſh Houſes on 1ſt May, and they were taken into conſideration by them on the 17th.

In the Lords a bill was introduced to repeal 6 of Geo. 1. and a reſolution entered into 'that it is indiſpenſable to 'the intereſts and happineſs of both kingdoms, that the 'connexion between them ſhould be eſtabliſhed by mutu-'al conſent on a ſolid and permanent footing, and that an 'humble addreſs be preſented to his Majeſty, that he 'will be pleaſed to take ſuch meaſures as in his royal 'wiſdom he ſhall ſeem think moſt conducive to that im-'portant end.'

On the ſame day the Commons, in a Committee of the whole Houſe, came to two reſolutions; one, that 6 G. 1. ought to be repealed; and the other, 'that it is 'indiſpenſable to the intereſts and happineſs of both 'kingdoms, that the connexion betweeen them ſhould be 'eſtabliſhed by mutual conſent, on a ſolid and permanent 'baſis,' to both of which the Houſe agreed nem. con. Leave was accordingly given for the bill, and an addreſs

voted

voted to the king, containing the ſubſtance of the latter reſolution, "that he be graciouſly pleaſed to take ſuch meaſures as his Majeſty in his royal wiſdom ſhall think moſt conducive to the eſtabliſhing, by mutual conſent, the connection between this kingdom and Ireland upon a ſolid and *permanent* baſis." This is the Reſolution that Mr. Pitt relies on, to ſhew that the Britiſh Legiſlature had ſome *further* meaſures of conſtitution in contemplation, than thoſe contained in the Iriſh addreſſes, and I will in candour ſuppoſe that he has been led into this erroneous inference by his miſtaking, and of courſe miſtating the date of it.

It is remarkable that although preſſed to it, he would not let it be read from the Journals, but boldly maintained that it would appear from them, that a *further* agreement between the two kingdoms, than the ſettlement of that ſeſſion, is there ſtated, in the opinion of the adminiſtration of the day, to be abſolutely neceſſary. Under this miſtaken impreſſion he aſſerts that *after* the Bill to repeal the 6 Geo. 1. was paſſed, an addreſs was moved and carried, praying his Majeſty to take ſuch *further* meaſures &c. (meaning the foregoing addreſs) whereas the Journals would have ſhewn that this addreſs was voted not only *before* the Bill paſſed, but *before* it was even preſented, and that no one meaſure of the adjuſtment had been at the time taken, but that this reſolution and addreſs were, on the part of the Commons, the commencement of it.—The addreſs was on the 17th May. The bill was not preſented till the 11th of June, and did not paſs till the 14th. Had this Addreſs been propoſed, as he miſtates, *after* the Bill had paſſed, that is, after the Iriſh Parliament had ſtated their perfect content by declaring "that no conſtitutional queſtion could ever after exiſt between the two kingdoms to interrupt their harmony," he

might poſſibly have had ſome reaſon to ſay, the movers of that Addreſs had *further* conſtitutional meaſures to propoſe, than thoſe which induced that declaration. It is under the miſtake of date that Mr. Pitt introduces into the reſolution the word *further*, whereas there is no ſuch word in it.

But not only the language of the Miniſters of the time, but every circumſtance of the proceedings ſhew that further conſtitutional meaſures were not in contemplation. Lord Shelburne in introducing the Addreſs to the Lords, after urging the expedience of repealing 6 Geo. 1. in which the two ſubjects of the Britiſh claim to bind Ireland, and the judicial appeal, were connected, ſays, "This repeal *was all he meant to propoſe as matter of* "*Parliamentary deciſion*, but there were other points "for the executive power, the alteration of Poyn- "ing's act, and of the perpetual mutiny Bill, in which "it would be wiſe to comply with the wiſhes of Ireland." This addreſs therefore, in common ſenſe, muſt have had thoſe points in view, and as to them, it meant to convey to his Majeſty the approbation of the Houſe to his exerciſe of his prerogative in aſſenting to ſuch Bills, as Ireland ſhould tranſmit for the purpoſe.

In the Commons, on the ſame day, Mr. Fox, after ſtating the various demands and grievances of Ireland, premiſed his motion on the reſolution, by obſerving that "the committee muſt ſee *that there were only one or two* "*points in which the interference of the Britiſh Parliament* "*was neceſſary*, the repeal of 6 Geo. 1. and the reſtora- "tion of the appellant juriſdiction to Ireland; the other "points lay before the Parliament and the King, and no "doubt he would, as one of the ſervants of the Crown, "adviſe his Majeſty to ſatisfy the other demands of his "Iriſh ſubjects," and to ſanction this advice the reſolution

was

was evidently pointed; but admit Mr. Fox might have had further objects in view, and those even of a *conſtitutional* concern, from the fear which he expreſſed, that Ireland might think of freſh grievances, we ſhall ſee that fear completely removed, when we recollect that this reſolution was agreed to on the 16th of May, ten days before it was communicated to the Iriſh Parliament in order to make the liberal intentions of Britain known,—that the Iriſh addreſs of the 28th May was founded on this very reſolution, to which it is an anſwer, and that Ireland therein declares her perfect ſatisfaction, and that the adjuſtment is *final*, by aſſuring his Majeſty "that no conſtitutional queſtion can ever hereafter exiſt between the kingdoms to interrupt their harmony."

There would have been a great abſurdity in that reſolution being laid before the Iriſh Parliament, if it meant *future arrangement* not alluded to in it or explained, when the object declared by his Majeſty was *an immediate and final* ſettlement—at all events Ireland did not conſider it to reſpect future arrangement, or if ſhe did, ſhe gaveit a complete anſwer in ſaying, every object was accompliſhed.

We ſee then, that whatever fear the Miniſter entertained on this head, if any—was effectually done away by this anſwer to his reſolution; for though he continued in office, and the Britiſh Parliament continued ſitting ſome months after, he did not renew the ſubject or bring forward any meaſure grounded on it, nor did Mr. Pitt when he became Miniſter, the commercial propoſitions only excepted. The fact ſeems to be, that the reſolution in reſpect to future meaſures had *commerce only in view*; Mr. Pitt ſays ſo, Lord Liverpool relies on it, and although Mr. Fox in the reply, which the noble Lord has read, ſays it was

to extend to political objects only, yet he explains them to be what are really commercial, by saying, that they alluded to, and were to comprehend the whole system of the *navigation of* the empire, and as such Mr. Pitt and Lord Liverpool relied on it, as a ground of the necessity of the commercial system of 1785.

Mr. Pitt said, "the meaning of the Resolution moved "in 1782 by the Right Hon. Gentleman himself, was "too stubborn and obvious to be explained away, or "denied." And Lord Liverpool's (then Mr. Jenkinson) words are very strong.—"The noble Lord had denied "that any proof had been given of there being any "necessity of coming to a system of commercial arrange- "ment with Ireland, and had contended no such neces- "sity existed. In answer to this, he should think it suf- "ficient to refer the noble Lord to the state of the two "countries, as an ample proof of the necessity, had he "no better proof to advert to; but he was furnished "with the best authority, the authority of that House. "And here he said he must again refer to the Resolu- "tion of May 17th, 1782, wherein it was declar- "ed, 'That it was indispensable to the interest and hap- "pines of both kingdoms that the connection between "them should be established by mutual consent, upon a "solid and permanent footing,' he was aware that the "Right Hon. Gentleman opposite to him had asserted "that the Resolution had no reference to a commercial "arrangement, and that it related merely to a political "one. He never, he declared, attended to hear what "was said in another place, but he had read in a news- "paper that a great authority who had sat in the Ca- "binet when that Resolution had been moved, had de- "clared it did mean a commercial arrangement. For "his part, he could not think it possible for those who framed

" framed the Reſolution to have had any arrangement " in their contemplation but a commercial one, and if " it did not mean that, he wiſhed the authors of it " would have been ſo good as to have declared what it " did mean."

After reading the addreſs of the Iriſh Parliament of May 28, which I have ſtated to you, it could hardly be believed that Mr. Pitt could aſſert, " That with reſpect to that part of the King's Meſſage which related to the propriety of adopting ſome meaſures for a *final* adjuſtment between the two countries, the Iriſh Commons were wholly ſilent,"—yet he has done it roundly and without reſerve in the very words I mention. Is the declaration in that addreſs, that no future conſtitutional queſtion could exiſt, mere ſilence? How? Has their language to the Lord Lieutenant of the full and perfect eſtabliſhment of their conſtitution, no meaning? What ſophiſtry of argument, what caſuiſtry of language can draw a diſtinction between the expreſſions that no future queſtion can exiſt, and that the matter is finally adjuſted; between the words final, and no longer exiſting—If it puts an end to all future queſtions, it muſt be final, becauſe what puts an end, is final—but the whole amount of his reaſoning is, that what puts an end to any thing, is not final. It is a powerful proof how little argument he has to ſtand on, when he reſorts to ſuch a wretched play upon words, on a ſubject of ſuch magnitude.

I would diſmiſs it without further obſervation, but that there is one part of that arrangement, and a moſt material one as to connexion, which he has ſlurred over without obſervation; I mean the modification which was then made of Poyning's law. It will not only fully diſprove his aſſertion, that nothing was then done by Ireland towards eſtabliſhing a connexion, but it will ſhew farther

the

the baſis on which it was then conſtituted and firmly placed.

The act making this modification, which regulates the manner of paſſing bills in Parliament, received very uncommon ſolemnity in its progreſs. It was moved for 31ſt of May, three days after the addreſs, and ſo eſſential was it deemed, that it was preſented as a bill, not as heads in the accuſtomed manner, and it was ſent to the Lords prior to its going to Council, and was carried to the Lord Lieutenant by a joint Committee of both Houſes. It enacts, that no Bill ſhall paſs into a Law in Ireland, unleſs it be returned under the Great Seal of Great Britain. Thus not leaving the connection a bare junction of two kingdoms under one Sovereign, but ſecuring the continuance of that connection, by making the Britiſh Miniſter anſwerable to the Britiſh nation, if any Law ſhould receive the Royal aſſent in Ireland, which could in any way injure the empire, be incompatible with its imperial intereſts, or tend to ſeparate Ireland from it. I did at the time ſay, and do now repeat, that the arrangement would have been imperfect, without this ſecurity attending what the Britiſh Miniſter weakly calls a Demolition of ſyſtem, and what we call a glorious Eſtabliſhment of the Conſtitution, confirming the freedom and independence of the Iriſh Parliament.

I do not heſitate to ſay, that in thus rendering the Great Seal of Britain neceſſary to the paſſing an Iriſh Law, if we created a theoretic difference in the Conſtitutions of the two kingdoms, which renders ours inferior, it is one not injurious to us, but neceſſary from our ſituation in the empire, and one with which we are content, and which ſecures Union and Connexion on a firm and laſting baſis.

I therefore

I therefore agree that the power of the Britiſh Parliament extends, as Mr. Dundas has ſtated, to the controul of the third eſtate of the Iriſh Parliament; but it is a controul on the King's naked power of aſſent only—and this very controul, I ſay, gives to Britain an effectual pledge to retain in her own hands, that it never ſhall be in our power by any act of ours to weaken or impair the connexion. On the other hand, we are not without a ſecurity on our part, for, by the confirmation of our independence, Britiſh law cannot bind us; and, therefore, the Union cannot be altered, impaired, or ſevered, (putting force and convulſion out of the caſe) except by our confirming the meaſure by a law of our own. Great Britain cannot throw us off. An act of the Britiſh Parliament is inadequate to it. As an inſtance, no law of hers could repeal our Annexation Act of Henry VIII.

If I wanted authority for the ſtatement I have given, Lord Auckland, in moving for the repeal of the 6th Geo. I. confirms what I ſay, in very explicit language:—"As "no Iriſh Bill can paſs into law, without the previous con- "ſent of the King in his Council of England; ſo there "was no danger that the independence of the legiſlature "of Ireland could be made uſe of to make laws injurious "to the ſiſter kingdom; the Engliſh Council being re- "ſponſible for every advice they gave their Sovereign, "and England would have nothing to fear from the en- "creaſed power of the Iriſh Parliament, as the conſent "of the King would be ſtill neceſſary to ſanctify all their "Acts."—Thus, then, our modification of Poyning's Law gives England a ſecurity that we cannot diſſolve or impair the connexion by any Act of our ſeparate Legiſlature, while the very independence of that ſeparate Legiſlature gives us a ſecurity that Great Britain cannot by

by any law of her's deſtroy it; we are by theſe two meaſures of that day, confirmed in what was, and ever muſt be our deareſt intereſt, in being an unalienable and inſeparate part of the Britiſh Empire, not joined together, as ſome have fooliſhly aſſerted, by the nonſenſe of a Fœderal Union; not, in Mr. Pitt's unmeaning language, by a connexion which hangs on a thread, expoſed to all the attacks of party, and all the effects of accident. Fatal would it be for us if it hung on a thread, expoſed, as he ſays, to all the attacks of party, and all the effects of accident; for he and his party have attacked it with ſuch weight of abuſe, ſuch a complication of inſulting threats, ſuch an ill-judged bombaſtic expoſure of our ſuppoſed weakneſſes to our enemies, and ſuch an unjuſtifiable attempt to conſolidate to his aid every accident of the circumſtances attending both our internal and external ſituation, that our not being convulſed by theſe very attempts, is a ſolid refutation of his aſſertion, and we may plume ourſelves the more on its ſtability, in as much as it is not in the range of human invention to ſuppoſe a more powerful attack of party, or a more artful application of all the accidental circumſtances which the preſent criſis has unfortunately brought to bear together at the ſame period.—No, Sir, we are, and we are happy to be a Dominion of the Crown of England; a conſtituent and inſeparable part of the Empire, under the ſame Sovereign; and the Acts of the executive, with regard to our legiſlation, are the Acts of the King of Great Britain as well as of Ireland in his Britiſh Council; unfortunate would it be for us if Ireland was held by a connection as of the perſon of the King only, and—[a cry of hear! hear! from the Treaſury Bench]—I am glad the noble Lord approves of what I ſay; I am glad he thus ſhews himſelf to be of opinion with me, that a better baſis already exiſts for a

connexion

connection between the two countries, than that which Mr. Pitt, and the noble Lord would fain impose on us.

Here, then, we see a new and incontrovertible ground whereon not only to assert that the adjustment was *final* as to the Irish constitution, but that it even fulfilled the construction given now by Mr. Pitt, to the resolution of 1782, however contrary to what he gave it in 1785. It also fulfilled his Majesty's gracious recommendations at the time, and in looking back to them, we shall find another proof of every object of constitution or constitutional connection being then considered as finally adjusted; for it is observable that the King, in his first Message, proposes the consideration of Irish grievances in order expressly to obtain a *Final Adjustment*, he uses the same words *Final Adjustment* in his Message by the Duke of Portland, stating his own and the British Parliament's intentions; but as soon as the Irish Parliament on hearing these intentions declared on the 27th of May their satisfaction, and that an end would be put thereby to all constitutional questions, he drops the expression of *Final Adjustment* ever after, and in his answer on the 13th of June, he declares his pleasure in receiving this Declaration, commends them for considering the attention of Great Britain as furnishing a *perpetual pledge of mutual amity*, applauds their zeal *to perpetuate the harmony*, and uphold the glory of the British empire, and he *mentions Final Adjustment no more.*

Would his Minister have advised him to these expressions, if the adjustment furnished no pledge; if it tended no way to perpetuate connection; in short, if it only destroyed the connection, as Mr. Pitt says, by demolishing one system, and not substituting another; or did they not advise him to this language, and

omit the further mention of Final Adjuſtment; becauſe they conſidered the declaration of the Iriſh Parliament, and the modification of Poyning's Law to have accompliſhed every object of conſtitutional adjuſtment, and conſtitutional connection?

But I will give you further evidence of their ſentiments having been as I ſtate them in July, 1782. The Lord Lieutenant's language to the Parliament, in the ſpeech which I have read to you was, that they ſhould convince the people that every cauſe of paſt jealouſy and diſcontent was *finally* removed (there his uſe of the expreſſion finally is deciſive); that both countries had pledged their faith to each other, and that their beſt ſecurity would be an adherence to that compact, that the two kingdoms were now one, indiſſolubly connected in unity of Conſtitution, and unity of intereſts, that they ſtand and fall together.

If the Britiſh Miniſter of that day had in view more than was done—if he thought the work incomplete as to his object, he would have followed up the meaſure to its completion, he would not have allowed the Duke of Portland to uſe language tending to impoſe on, and not to conciliate both kingdoms. He would not have added to a dereliction of duty, a groſs and unworthy deceit—nor would his Grace have ſubmitted to the mean office of ſtating a compact that was never made, a unity that was not formed—that both kingdoms were indiſſolubly one, when the very meaſure, in Mr. Pitt's ideas, untied the only bond that held the two kingdoms together.

Mr. Pitt could not have been ignorant of all theſe facts in 1782, however he may have forgot them in 1799—and that he was not ignorant of them, but conſi-

dered

dered the work of 1782 as final and complete to its object of conſtitutional concerns, I may appeal to his own conduct the year following, when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer, and ſpoke to the ſubject on Mr. Grenville's motion—and when, if the meaſures of 1782 were incomplete, if the reſolution of 1782 alluded to further objects of Conſtitution, he had had ſeveral months for conſideration, and it would have been his duty to have propoſed means to ſupply the defect, whereas he did not in that ſpeech complain of any defect, nor talk of any Conſtitutional meaſures unfiniſhed as part of the ſyſtem of 1782. He became Miniſter the year after, and I may appeal more forcibly to his conduct ever ſince, full fifteen years, during all which time he has done nothing towards Conſtitution—nay not only done nothing, but even during the Commercial Propoſitions in 1785, not a word did he utter to imply that the ſettlement of 1782 was not final as to Conſtitution.

He muſt either then retract his new doctrines of 1799, or plead guilty to a ſhameful and continued dereliction of his duty, in having ſuffered the empire to remain during 15 years in a ſtate which he now repreſents as having all the while endangered its very exiſtence. The fact is, he was guilty of no dereliction, and I am happy in any thing to be his advocate. The meaſures of 1782, were all conſtitutional and final, notwithſtanding he has begun in 1799 to ſay otherwiſe.

Any one of the many proofs I have adduced, would be ſufficient to juſtify me in aſſerting, that the ſettlement of 1782, ſo far as regarded *conſtitution and conſtitutional connection, was final*—and I moſt devoutly truſt it ever will remain ſo. I might reſt ſingly on the opinions of the Iriſh Parliament, repeated often throughout

three months in various ways (which Mr. P. never ſtated), or the opinions of the Britiſh Parliament and Britiſh Miniſters, who conducted the meaſure, which he relied on with ſuch an aſſuming ſuperiority, or even on his own conduct at the time, or on his conduct and language in 1785, or on his conduct and language ever ſince; but the whole concurrence of them forms ſuch a maſs of evidence, ſuch a chain of incontrovertible argument, that he muſt have more than common dullneſs, or a moſt perſevering obſtinacy, who can entertain a doubt upon the ſubject.

Further to expoſe the futility of his aſſertion, that nothing was done in 1782 towards connection, I might remind you of one other meaſure of connection attending that period, the act called Lord Yelverton's, which paſſed the ſame day with the one I have juſt explained as to the Britiſh ſeal. Its preamble ſtates a principle of connection for the future conduct of our Legiſlature—"Whereas "it is the earneſt and affectionate deſire, as well as true "intereſt, of your Majeſty's ſubjects of this kingdom, to "promote, as far as in them lies, the navigation, trade, "and commercial intereſts of Great Britain as well as "Ireland—and whereas a ſimilarity of laws, manners, "and cuſtoms, muſt naturally conduce to ſtrengthen and "perpetuate that affection and harmony which do, and at "all times ought to ſubſiſt between the people of Great "Britain and Ireland"—and the body of it proceeds on the ſame principle, by enacting, "That all ſuch clauſes and "proviſions contained in any ſtatutes made in England or "Great Britain, concerning commerce, as import to im-"poſe equal reſtraints on the ſubjects of both kingdoms, "or to entitle them to equal benefits or as equally con-"cern the ſeamen of both kingdoms, ſave ſo far as the "ſame have been altered or repealed, ſhall be accepted, "uſed, and executed in this kingdom, according to the

"preſent

"preſent tenor thereof reſpectively," thus enacting at one ſtroke every law of Britain reſpecting commerce, and making it the uniform law of the whole empire, if it equally affected the whole empire.

Let us look back then for a moment to facts, and contraſt them with Mr. Pitt's aſſertions. Ireland ſaid in 1782, "*no conſtitutional queſtion can ever after exiſt to "interrupt the harmony of the two kingdoms. Conſtitution "is finally ſettled.*" Mr. Pitt ſays, we are a ſilly nation—we did not underſtand the words we uſed, and there was no final ſettlement.

Ireland in 1782, placed a negative controul in Great Britain over her acts, in order to ſecure the connection. Mr. Pitt ſays we are miſtaken, and did nothing, or it's of no avail.

His Majeſty applauds the Iriſh Parliament for their declaration that the *conſtitutional connection between the two kingdoms, is eſſential to their intereſt and happineſs.* Mr. Pitt ſays it is all a mockery—there is no conſtitutional connection.

His Majeſty congratulates them on their declaration that *no Conſtitutional queſtion can exiſt to interrupt harmony.* Mr. Pitt ſays it is all unfounded, and every conſtitutional queſtion ſtill exiſts that can interrupt their harmony.

His Majeſty ſays *the attention of the Britiſh Parliament to Ireland, furniſhed a perpetual pledge of amity*; the Iriſh Parliament ſaid the ſame; but Mr. Pitt ſays it was no pledge, or it muſt be deſtroyed, to introduce a wild theory of his own, not aſked or ſought for by either nation.

The

The Iriſh Parliament ſaid, *the conſtitution which they recovered in* 1782, *bound them to perpetuate the harmony, ſtability, and glory of the empire.* Mr. Pitt ſays he will annihilate that conſtitution, at the riſk even of that harmony, and without regard to the circumſtances of the times, which may make the attempt peculiarly fatal.

The Iriſh Parliament ſtates with gratitude to the Duke of Portland then Lord Lieutenant, that *their conſtitution is fully and perfectly eſtabliſhed.* Mr. Pitt ſays it is all a falſehood—we neither have, nor ought to have, nor can have a conſtitution of our own.

The ſame Lord Lieutenant tells the Commons that *to ſettle the conſtitution of Ireland on a ſecure foundation, and to unite its intereſts and affections with thoſe of Great Britain,* were the principal objects of his adminiſtration, and he is happy *that they are accompliſhed* Mr. Pitt gives his Grace a direct contradiction, and tells Ireland, Don't believe the Duke of Portland; there was no conſtitution ſettled—no foundation formed—no intereſts united—or if there were, that he muſt annihilate that conſtitution, deſtroy the foundations of it, and with it all that unity of intereſt and affection which Ireland ſaid reſted on them.

The ſame Lord Lieutenant deſires you to convince the nation, as you are yourſelves convinced, *that every cauſe of jealouſy and diſcontent is finally removed.* No ſuch thing, ſays Mr. Pitt; there was no final ſettlement to remove them, or if there was, it muſt be given up, and I will riſk their being arouſed afreſh.

The Viceroy proceeds—*both countries have pledged their faith to each other, their beſt ſecurity will be an inviolable adherence to that compact*—I deny any compact, ſays Mr.

Mr. Pitt, and I will break that pledge, and here let me requeſt your attention, while I aſk that gentleman and his repreſentative here, if this be his conduct, as to a compact ſo ſolemnly made and ratified by both nations; what reliance can this kingdom place on his adherence to any compact on which he would reſt his projected Union, eſpecially when there would not be an Iriſh Parliament ſitting then, as there is now, to enforce and protect it?

The ſame Viceroy goes on, "*the two kingdoms are now one, indiſſolubly connected in unity of conſtitution, and and unity of intereſts, and they muſt ſtand or fall together.*" You are not indiſſolubly connected, " ſays Mr. Pitt, your connection hangs by a thread, your conſtitution is of a nature to prevent unity, and your ſeparate intereſts are deſtroying that connection, which the Viceroy called indiſſoluble."

Does this Gentleman who thus contradicts King, Lords, Commons, Viceroy, and himſelf, forget our ſolemn acknowledgment of that day, let him look to our Journals that I have read to you, and he will find that we thought our connection ſo happily ſettled, and our connection with Britain rendered ſo ſecure, that the whole nation deſired to return their ſolemn thanks to God for *that Union, harmony and cordial affection which the final adjuſtment of* 1782 *ſecured to both kingdoms.* In theſe thanks we acknowledged our intereſts to be inſeparably the ſame, and offered our unfeigned gratitude to the Almighty for his bleſſings to both kingdoms, and the accompliſhment of that final adjuſtment. All a miſtake, ſays Mr. Pitt, you called Heaven to witneſs in vain, there was no final adjuſtment.

Need

Need I go farther? is not the impoſition too groſs, even for the dulleſt underſtanding ever imputed to the Iriſh climate? every thing ſhews you the adjuſtment was final; it is our Second, if not our Great *Magna Charta*, and he would never labour with ſo much, but ſo impotent ſophiſtry to deny it, if he did not know its value and its ſtrength.

A Union is in its inſtant operation a total extinction of it, and after it has not only ſecured, but abſolutely ſhowered down upon you, more bleſſings, more trade, more affluence than ever fell to your lot, in double the ſpace of time which has elapſed ſince its attainment; will you be cajoled, duped, or threatened into a ſurrender of it? Forbid it, every honeſt heart that glows with Iriſh patriotiſm, and forbid it Heaven, whoſe bleſſings we implored on its perpetual continuance. For years you laboured to acquire it, in 1782 it crowned your glorious efforts, and did you gain it only to deſtroy it? will you give ear to the folly that you aſked it in order to annihilate it? for ſuch is the conſummate folly of thoſe who argue that the Britiſh reſolutions which confirmed it, looked at the very time to future meaſures for deſtroying it.

Is it to be ſuppoſed, (to return again to the reſolution Mr. Pitt relies on,) that when a free conſtitution was offered to Ireland, it was accompanied with a reſolution to deſtroy it? and that that very reſolution was preſented to our Parliament at the ſame moment with the offer of that free conſtitution? No, Sir, Union and the Conſtitution of 1782 are incompatible, they are direct oppoſites, and that is the reaſon why I lay ſo much ſtreſs on the adjuſtment of 1782, becauſe while we hold it ſacred, *this accurſed Union* never can take place. I am not ſo ſilly as to ſay its being final, renders it phyſically or politically unalterable; but I ſtate its perfection

to

to urge its value and its efficacy for every end of happineſs, and I ſhew you the dangers which muſt follow its annihilation, to warn you againſt ſurrendering it. I ſay again that it is not to be wondered at, that thoſe who now adviſe the ruinous meaſure of an Union—a meaſure calculated to diſturb the harmony and threaten the exiſtence of the empire, ſhould wiſh to calumniate the glorious conſtitution of 1782, and aſcribe to it neither permanency of principle, nor permanency of adjuſtment.

I have ſhewn you, that if the Miniſter in 1782 looked forward to any meaſures beyond that year, it was to commercial ones only. No advance was made as to commerce in general, except what was done by Yelverton's bill. I will therefore now examine the following meaſures of 1785, which were merely commercial, and the proceedings and opinions declared by the Parliaments of both Kingdoms, and all the miniſters concerned will add many incontrovertible proofs to what I have already adduced ſo many proofs to, that the adjuſtment of 1782 was conſtitutional only, and final.

Towards the cloſe of the Iriſh ſeſſion following that of 1782, the Commons addreſs the Duke of Rutland:—

"We reflect with true pride and ſatisfaction upon "the ſolid advantages which have been obtained for this "country within a very ſhort period. We are aware of "the ſituation of the empire, and the peculiar circum- "ſtances which have *prevented the adjuſtment of ſome* "*points which concern our trade and manufactures*, and we "rely upon the readineſs of your Grace's liberal and

" benevolent assistance for the furtherance of such prac-
" tical measures, as deliberate wisdom and generous
" policy may adapt to our real necessities and general
" interests," and here mark the words, the adjustment of some points which concern our trade and manufactures; —not a word about Constitution,—it was all settled.

The day following the Commons, in an address to his Majesty, which passed Nem. Con. represent to him " their warmest hope, that the " interval between this session and the next will " afford sufficient opportunity for forming a wise and " well digested plan, for a liberal arrangement of " *commercial* intercourse between Great Britain and " Ireland to be then brought forward; that such a " plan formed upon the broad basis of reciprocal ad-" vantage, would be the most effectual means of " strengthening the empire at large, and cherishing the " common interests and brotherly affections of both " kingdoms."

The Recess was accordingly employed in forming such a plan, and it is well known, that I, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, had the honour of being called on by the British Minister to assist in the work.

The next session opened with a Speech from the Duke of Rutland, which begins with these words.

" I am to recommend, in the King's name, to your " earnest investigation, those objects of *trade and* " *commerce* between Great Britain and Ireland, which " have not yet received their compleat adjustment." (Mark the expression—*which have not yet received their compleat*

compleat adjuſtment.) "In framing a plan, with a view "to a final ſettlement, you will be ſenſible that the "intereſts of Great Britain and Ireland, ought to be for "ever united and inſeparable, and his Majeſty relies on "your liberality and wiſdom for adopting ſuch an equi-"table ſyſtem, for the joint benefit of both countries, "and the ſupport of the common intereſt, as will ſe-"cure mutual ſatisfaction and permanency. The uni-"formity of laws and of religion, and *a common in-"tereſt in treaties* with foreign ſtates, form a ſure bond "of mutual connection and attachment between Great "Britain and Ireland: it will be your care to cheriſh "thoſe inestimable bleſſings, with that ſpirit and wiſdom "which will render them effectual ſecurities to the "ſtrength and proſperity of the empire."

You will obſerve, that treaties with foreign ſtates are here mentioned, becauſe it ſhews they were in conſider-ation as part of the commercial ſubject afterwards de-clared final. They have been ſtated by the noble Lord to-day as an imperial conſideration calling for a Union, and not capable of arrangement by a diſtinct legiſlature?

A plan was ſubmitted to the Iriſh Commons in eleven propoſitions which were agreed to, and the ad-dreſs conveying them to the throne received, I may ſay, the univerſal and warm approbation of the Houſe, as on a diviſion there were no Noes except the Tellers. Both Houſes joined in the Addreſs, which ſhews the decided ſentiment of Parliament, that the paſſing of theſe Reſolutions into Law, would have completely anſwered all the purpoſes of the preſent project.

The Addreſs is worth attending to:—

"That our gratitude is peculiarly due to his Majeſty, for the meaſures which, ſince laſt ſeſſion of Parliament, have been taken by his royal command, "*towards forming an arrangement of commercial intercourſe between Great Britain and Ireland.* That with the moſt ſanguine hope they look forward to the *confirmation of theſe reſolutions*, containing the principles upon which, they truſt, the commercial intereſts of the two nations will be *finally eſtabliſhed.* When theſe ſhall be happily and fully carried into effect, through his Majeſty's paternal goodneſs, and the wiſdom and liberality of his Parliaments of Great Britain and Ireland, they ſhall, with the moſt ſincere ſatisfaction, behold a *ſyſtem eſtabliſhed upon the firm baſis of reciprocal advantage, which will completely ſtrengthen and cement the common intereſt and mutual affection of both kingdoms, and will indiſſolubly unite the efforts of all his Majeſty's* ſubjects of Great Britain and Ireland, *in maintaining the ſtrength, increaſing the reſources, and extending the power and credit of the Britiſh empire*—and that it is their fervent prayer, that his Majeſty may long poſſeſs the true reward of a great and generous mind, in beholding the bleſſings derived under his royal auſpices, and in receiving the juſt tribute of the moſt zealous duty and attachment from his loyal and affectionate people."

In Great Britain the King, in opening the ſeſſion of the ſame year, (1785), ſaid, "Among the objects which now require conſideration, I muſt particularly recommend to your earneſt attention the *adjuſtment of ſuch points in the commercial intercourſe between Great Britain and Ireland, as are not yet finally arranged.* The

"ſyſtem

"ſyſtem which will unite both kingdoms moſt cloſely on "principles of reciprocal advantage, will, I am per-"ſuaded, beſt ſecure the general proſperity of my do-"minions."

Obſerve here, from the proceedings in both kingdoms, that *commercial arrangement* only was in contemplation—and Mr. Pitt's words, when he introduced the ſubject, deſerve particular attention:

"There was not a man in the Houſe who would not "agree, that ſettling the commercial intercourſe of the "two kingdoms on a firm, liberal, and permanent baſis, "by which an end might be put to all jealouſies and "clamour, and by which all future pretexts to diſcontent "might be removed, and by which the ſureſt foundations "of future ſtrength and opulence might be laid, was "one of the greateſt topics which could be agitated "in Parliament, and one of the moſt deſirable objects "that they could accompliſh."

Again—"He deſires the Houſe to recollect, that "amongſt the many objects to which the Legiſlature had "for ſome years directed its attention, the affairs of Ire-"land, and the forming a ſuitable arrangement between "that country and this, were nearly the moſt conſidera-"ble. A vaſt deal had already been done by former ad-"miniſtrations, but not enough—and his preſent plan was "*nothing more than a neceſſary ſupplement* to thoſe which "had formerly been adopted (meaning thoſe of 1779 and "1780, and the ſettlement of 1782), for the purpoſe of "creating ſuch a mutual intereſt as ſhould for ever pre-"ſerve inviolable and ſecure the connection between the "countries."

Here

Here we have his own authority for all that was neceſſary at that day to ſecure the connexion inviolate, and form a complete arrangement. The previous meaſure of conſtitutional ſettlement in 1782, was in his opinion of that day, final and complete as to its object. His *ſupplement* of commercial arrangement alone was wanting to perfect all; let us examine it; not a word in it of conſtitution, of the concerns of peace and war, which the noble Lord and he now ſo magnify, of treaties which the Duke of Rutland ſuggeſted for conſideration; of theſe difficulties which he now ſtates as curable only by his new medicine; (all of which I ſhall bye and by remove)—not a word of Regency, the object of the preſent bill, or of the objections he now ſtarts to the independence of our Legiſlature.

But I will not only give you his authority in 1785, I will ſhew you the ſame ſentiment expreſſed in the ſame year in ſtronger language, by both Houſes, in a joint Addreſs, which he moved in the Commons, and by his Majeſty's Anſwer to it.

The Addreſs ſays;—

"We have thus far performed our part in this important buſineſs; and we truſt, that in the whole of its "progreſs, reciprocal intereſts and mutual affection will "inſure that ſpirit of Union, ſo eſſentially neceſſary to the "great end which the two countries have equally in view.

"In this perſuaſion we look forward with confidence to "*the final completion of a meaſure which, while it tends* "*to perpetuate the harmony and friendſhip between the* "*two kingdoms, muſt by augmenting their reſources,*

"*uniting*

"*uniting their efforts, and conſolidating their ſtrength, af-*
"*ford your Majeſty the ſureſt means of eſtabliſhing on a*
"*laſting foundation, the ſafety, proſperity, and glory of*
"*the empire.*"

To which his Majeſty replied:

"A full and equal participation of commercial ad-
"vantages, and a ſimilarity of laws in thoſe points
"which are neceſſary for their preſervation and ſecurity,
"*muſt be the ſureſt bond of Union between the two king-*
"*doms*, and the ſource of reciprocal and increaſing be-
"nefits to both."

Thus do the Lords and Commons of Great Britain declare, that the meaſures propoſed in 1785, which were all commercial, will perpetuate harmony between the two kingdoms, and muſt, by augmenting their reſources, uniting their efforts, and conſolidating their ſtrength, afford the ſureſt means of eſtabliſhing on a laſting foundation the ſafety, proſperity, and glory of the empire—the very phraſes and high-ſounding language which he applies to his plan of Union.

Thus does the King ſay, that the ſame meaſures muſt be the ſureſt *bond of Union* between the kingdoms, and the ſource of reciprocal and increaſing benefits to both.

And thus, what Mr. Pitt, the Parliament, and the King, all declared ſufficient and complete in 1785, to have worked all the wonders of his preſent Noſtrum, without any of the poiſonous, political, or conſtitutional ingredients, he would now doſe us with, this ſame Mr.

Pitt

Pitt ſays, in 1799, was *a partial and inadequate meaſure.* Theſe are his very expreſſions as publiſhed.

What in 1785 he declared to be a ſupplement to the eſtabliſhment of 1782, cannot in 1799 be accompliſhed without deſtroying that eſtabliſhment, which it was to ſupport and ſtrengthen.

In 1785, he told you that the meaſure he then propoſed "was to preſerve and ſecure the connection inviolate."—He tells you now it would not have done either; it was *a partial and inadequate meaſure.*

In 1785, he told you "it was the only poſſible means by which the connection between the two kingdoms could effectually and with prudence be eſtabliſhed;"—his very words as recorded in Debrett's Debates;—and he now tells you, *it was partial and inadequate,* and could not have eſtabliſhed any thing.

In 1785 he ſtated "it was to form a final adjuſtment of commercial intereſts between the two countries—in 1799, he ſays the adjuſtment would have been *partial and inadequate.* And thus he again puzzles us with his uſe of the word *final.* In 1782 what puts an end to any thing, is not final.—In 1785 what is partial and inadequate, is final.

In 1785 "it was one of the greateſt topics which could be agitated in Parliament;" now it is no great topic, but *a partial and inadequate meaſure.*

In 1785 it was "of the greateſt and moſt deciſive importance to both kingdoms, ſince the end and object was no leſs than to eſtabliſh a ſyſtem that ſhould be permanent

nent and irrevocable, (his own words, as Debrett records them), but now that ſyſtem is called *partial and inadequate.*

In 1785 he ſtates the meaſure to be "the one among "all the objects of his political life the moſt important "he had ever engaged in, nor did he imagine he ſhould "ever meet another, that would call forth all his feelings, "and rouſe every exertion of his heart in ſo forcible a "manner—a meaſure in which he verily believes was in-"volved every proſpect that ſtill remained to Great Bri-"tain of again lifting her head to that height and emi-"nence which ſhe poſſeſſed among nations."—He tells you now, it had no importance, it was a *partial and inadequate meaſure.*

Would to God he had kept thoſe ſame feelings, and that ſame heart of 1785 to actuate his conduct at this day, and our growing proſperity and happineſs would not be interrupted, as they now are, by his wild projects! Would to God he had preſerved the conſiſtency, which I preſerved, and he has abandoned, and he would not now bring the connection and ſafety of this kingdom into hazard, by endeavouring in 1799 to deſtroy the final adjuſtment of 1782, which in 1785 he propoſed to ſtrengthen and perpetuate for ever!

And is this the conſiſtent gentleman who is wantonly and unprovokedly to charge me with inconſiſtence? and what inconſiſtence does he charge me with? that I expreſsly ſtated in 1785 that the final adjuſtment of 1782 could not laſt. Not even the imperfect record of my language that day, aſſerts any thing like it. I never ſaid ſo, expreſsly or impliedly; on the contrary, I deemed that adjuſtment ſo ſacred, ſo valuable, and ſo rivetted to the intereſt and feelings of the whole kingdom, that I premiſed what I was going to ſay by the following

words:—" (Mr. Foſter ſaid) he could not ſit ſilent when " he heard a meaſure in which he was proud to have " had a conſiderable part, repreſented by ſo many gentle- " men as injurious to the independence of the Iriſh le- " giſlature, and a barter of the conſtitution for com- " merce. *He ſhould think himſelf, indeed, unworthy of a " ſeat in that Houſe, or of the name of Iriſhman, if he " could conſent to barter an atom of the conſtitution of his " country, for all the commerce in the world*; but he was " ſo fully ſatisfied the preſent meaſure did not violate it, " in the ſmalleſt degree, that he could not repreſs his ſur- " priſe at its being ſuppoſed to do ſo." Here I cannot help remarking, that in a publication of Mr. Pitt's ſpeech with an extract annexed, of what Woodfall recorded of me at that period; theſe words are wholly omitted, though they are in Woodfall's debates.

And in the laſt debate on it I ſaid that " I would ſtand " or fall with the bill, that not a line in it touches our " conſtitution," and not a line did touch it, whatever interpretation might be put on the alterations made by Mr. Pitt in the propoſitions. I aſſert the Iriſh Parliament never gave a deciſion on theſe alterations, nor was any queſtion ever put here upon one of them. The advocates for the commercial propoſitions wiſely choſe to expreſs their ſentiments, in a bill which effected every purpoſe, without adopting even any the moſt diſtant or doubtful encroachment on the independence of our Legiſlature. This bill is on your records.

By what fatality this meaſure failed at the time, and how the alterations made by Britain overthrew it I need not ſtate; I will only ſay, that where a ſuſpicion, that the operation of them might affect the independence of our Legiſlature, created ſuch a general diſapprobation as obliged him to abandon the meaſure, he ſhould have learned

learned wiſdom thereby, and not have propoſed at this day, to a nation ſo greatly attached to that independence, and the more ſo for her riſing proſperity ſince its attainment, a meaſure which does not barely go to alter it, but avowedly and expreſsly to extinguiſh it; he ſhould have recollected, that he now offers no one practical or even ſpeculative advantage in commerce when the total extinction is required; and that a meaſure ſuſpected only to infringe on that independence failed in his hands, though accompanied with offers of ſolid and ſubſtantial benefit to trade.

The meaſure then of 1782 was all conſtitutional—that of 1785 all commercial—and to ſelect general expreſſions made uſe of on the one ſubject, and apply them to the other, ſhews no great candour in reaſoning; however, I can ſafely give him all the advantage of it, and ſtill refute him.

The words aſcribed to me in the publication by Woodfall, were ſuppoſed to be ſpoken in the debate before the propoſitions were agreed to—"That things could not remain as they were."—I believe I did uſe that expreſſion, at leaſt I accede to it, becauſe it was my ſentiment, and I ſay ſo ſtill, that things could not have remained as they were—and things do not remain as they were.

By what fatality is it that he cannot recollect that the great grounds of commercial jealouſy, which it was the object of 1785 to ſettle for the permanency of our connexion, and to which alone my words applied, have been ſince adjuſted by laws of his own ſupporting in the one kingdom, and approbation in the other.

I repeat again the ſame aſſertion, *things have not remained as they were.* The conſtruction of the navigation act, which prevented Britain receiving colonial or

foreign goods through Ireland, has been done away in 1793, by a law, introduced by Lord Hobart, to permit the import into Great Britain from Ireland, of all goods of the growth, produce, or manufacture of the Britiſh colonies, or of Aſia, Africa, or America. The former conſtruction, was the great and conſtant object of Iriſh jealouſy, and it was a leading meaſure in the propoſitions of 1785.

In the ſame year, in order to remove a great and preſſing object of Britiſh jealouſy, which was likewiſe a great and fundamental article in thoſe propoſitions, we reſtrained, by an Iriſh act, Ireland's acknowledged right to trade within the limits of the Eaſt India Company's charter, and confirmed to that Company their monopoly of the whole trade to all the world beyond the Cape of Good Hope and Streights of Magellan—although when Mr. Eden, in 1785, talked "of the period of the expiration of the Company's charter not being very diſtant, and that there remained no power in Britain to renew it or any excluſive privilege," he ſaid, "that the diſpoſition which was already manifeſted in Ireland, to avail themſelves of the advantages of the Oriental trade, would ſhew that on ſuch an event they would not be induced to reſign their pretenſions."

We adopted the navigation act, which Great Britain juſtly boaſts to be a main prop of the commercial ſyſtem on which the naval ſtrength of the empire reſts, by making it Iriſh law, not by reciting its proviſions, but taking it in toto by its title.

We enacted the ſame laws for regiſtry of ſhipping, for increaſe of ſhipping, for manifeſts—all great and imperial objects to the trade of the empire.

We

We eſtabliſhed the neceſſary regulation for Greenwich Hoſpital, and Light-houſe duties.

In ſhort there is no one meaſure of general or imperial concern, or even of colonial trade, unattended to by us, or left for Iriſh law to enact a ſimilarity of rule in.

I do not call the arrangement of duties on the interchange of native productions or manufactures, between the two kingdoms, an object of imperial concern; but if I did, I would aſſert on the authority of Mr. Pitt, of the Parliaments of both countries, and of experience, that ſeparate Legiſlatures are perfectly competent to it, and the more ſo, as more likely to give that ſtability which mutual content and ſatisfaction can alone ſecure. And I would further aſſert, that every practicable benefit in that reſpect, which thoſe propoſitions might have arranged, is actually and practically enjoyed ever ſince, and will continue to be ſo, as long as mutual intereſt and good-will ſhall direct each country.

Our object was to ſecure the continuance of the intercourſe in a ſort of *ſtatu quo*, and ſo it remains.

I will not heſitate then to ſay, name to me any one matter of general or imperial concern which thoſe propoſitions would have arranged, and which is not arranged—if you can, I ſhould not fear to ſay, the ſame attention will inſtantly adopt it, and that he is not a good Iriſhman who knows of any ſuch, and refuſes to ſuggeſt it. Let the noble lord propoſe them, and not keep the country in agitation by ſuſpending this ruinous meaſure over it. Let the ſilly attempt to encourage its revival, by getting reſolutions privately ſigned for it, be abandoned. If you doubt the general execration in which it is held, call the counties—take their ſenſe at public meetings,

ings, inſtead of preventing theſe meetings, leſt the general ſenſe ſhould be known, and put an end to all the idle and ſilly tricks of circulating ſtories that this gentleman and that gentleman has changed his mind. Why, Sir, it has been told induſtriouſly that I have altered my opinion—what I have already ſaid ſhews I have not; but the noble lord ſhall have ample proof of it, before I ſit down.

But, to return to my argument—I aſk where is the difference of our ſituation now from what it would have been, had the commercial meaſures of 1785 been eſtabliſhed?—None in fact. The only diſtinction is, that what the policy of that day intended to have made matter of *compact*, the mutual intereſt, common concern, brotherly affection, and inviolable connection of the two kingdoms, have effected voluntarily and gradually ſince—and thus we have not only looked forward with the Britiſh Parliament to the final completion of a meaſure which, to uſe their emphatic language, muſt perpetuate harmony between the kingdoms, augment their reſources, unite their efforts, conſolidate their ſtrength, and eſtabliſh on a laſting foundation the ſafety, proſperity, and glory of the empire; but we have attained it, and the empire is actually in the complete practical enjoyment of all its benefits, and of the full and equal participation of commercial advantages, and that ſimilarity of laws for their preſervation, which his Majeſty, like the wiſe and benevolent father of all his people, declared to be the ſureſt bond of union between the two kingdoms, actually and effectually exiſts.

It is charged further to me, that I not only ſaid in 1785, that things could not remain as they were, ſpeaking of the commercial propoſitions, but that I added,

ded, "commercial jealouſy is roufed, it will increaſe with "two independent Legiſlatures, if they don't mutually "declare the principles whereby their powers ſhall be ſe- "parately employed, in directing the common concerns "of trade."

I was right in that aſſertion; the navigation act, Eaſt-India act, and other laws ſince, have extinguiſhed the commercial jealouſy I alluded to, and declared the principles I mentioned, and each Legiſlature has been effectually employed thereby in directing the common concerns of trade.

I added too, "that without united intereſt of com- "merce, in a commercial empire, political union "will receive many ſhocks, and ſeparation of intereſt "muſt threaten ſeparation of connection, which "every honeſt Iriſhman muſt ſhudder to look at."—Now, thanks to the good ſenſe of both kingdoms, that united intereſt of commerce has been cheriſhed and maintained by thoſe very laws, and in every circumſtance from that day a mutual affection, a wiſh to ſupport a mutual and common intereſt, has marked every act of either Legiſlature, and of courſe no political ſhock has ariſen, nor could ariſe, ſave only the fatal and deſperate ſhock which now awaits us, from this unprovoked, unneceſſary, and deſtructive project of a Legiſlative Union—a ſhock which, if perſevered in, muſt threaten ſeparation of connection, which every honeſt man, Engliſhman or Iriſhman, *muſt ſhudder even to look at as a poſſible event.*

Is there a word in all the language aſcribed to me in 1785, againſt the final adjuſtment of 1782? Quite the contrary—I argued that two independent Legiſlatures exiſted, and therefore commercial ſettlement was neceſſary. I took their exiſtence as a poſition not to be

ference.

altered, or controverted, and therefore drew that inference. He agreed with me then in the theory, and has ſince realiſed it into practice, by the laws I have mentioned. But to put the argument in the ſtrongeſt logical form it will bear, two independent Legiſlatures and unſettled commerce cannot exiſt together with ſafety; but commerce has been ſettled, and therefore the two independent Legiſlatures may exiſt—or again, either a Legiſlative Union, or a ſettlement of commerce muſt take place, the ſettlement of commerce has taken place, therefore the Legiſlative Union need not. The fair ſtatement is, as it would have ſtood in 1785—two independent Legiſlatures and unſettled commerce cannot exiſt with ſafety, but the two independent Legiſlatures muſt exiſt, therefore the commerce muſt be ſettled, and it has been.

I will only add, that the preſent flouriſhing ſtate of the Empire confirms my aſſertion, that things have not remained as they were; for if his prediction was true, Great Britain could not, if they ſo remained, have lifted her head to that height and eminence which ſhe once poſſeſſed among nations, whereas ſhe not only has done ſo, but has towered above the whole ſurrounding world, notwithſtanding the queſtion in 1785 failed, in which queſtion, to uſe his own words, was involved every proſpect that ſtill remained to her of doing ſo. His aſſertion was right, and it has proved true; why? becauſe every meaſure in his view, when he made that declaration, has actually taken place ſince, although the mode of effecting them as propoſed in 1785 was abandoned at the time, and here I will diſmiſs this part of the ſubject, with applying it as a full anſwer to one of his diſjunctive ſophiſms, which he ſtates ſo boldly when he aſks, "how "is the evil of commercial jealouſies acting upon the laws

laws of two independent legiſlatures to be remedied? and anſwers: by two means only, either by ſome compact entered into by the legiſlatures of the two countries, or elſe by blending the two legiſlatures together. I defy the wit of man, he ſays, to point out a third. I anſwer, his own conduct and that of both the kingdoms has pointed out a third, that of the good ſenſe and mutual intereſt of each country from time to time, paſſing all laws neceſſary to prevent the operation or inconveniencies of commercial jealouſies: a mode which was not as certain at the time as the Propoſitions, becauſe there was no ſecurity of its being adopted, but which being carried into execution, is not only equally effectual, but is more ſure and permanent, in as much as mutual good-will and intereſt form a more indiſſoluble junction than the compulſion of law, which as between ſtates, has never proved a valid bond, when the others ceaſed to exiſt.

Experience too ſhews us this third mode has anſwered, for though we have greatly extended and encreaſed our trade, not a jealouſy has ariſen to interrupt harmony; on the contrary, the final adjuſtment of 1782 has proved itſelf, as w then ſtated it would be, a ſure pledge of mutual amity. This refutes too, (if it had not been already refuted) his ſtrange aſſertion, that there is not a man who believes there is a ſolid bond of connexion between the countries; if he means by ſolid that only which is by expreſs and written compact, I anſwer, a connexion founded on the content, the intereſt, the affection of the country, alone deſerves the name of ſolid, ſuch we are in the ample and full poſſeſſion of, and any other, which affects to bind by a parchment roll againſt inclination, intereſt and feeling, is too frail to continue long. Bonds of force, or even deluded or deluſive conſent, will only exiſt to be broken, ſuch bonds ſoon aſſume the galling ſhape of

fetters, and the more they are felt, the greater exertion will be provoked to throw them off; whereas thoſe of intereſt and good will grow ſtronger in proportion to the feeling they arouſe. But let us examine fully this part of the exiſting connexion between the two kingdoms; and the noble Lord invites me to it, for he reſts all his arguments on the inſufficiency of the preſent connexion.

We might have expected that the advocates for innovation and changing the ſituation in which we are rapidly thriving, inſtead of general and bare aſſertions that there is not a ſufficient connexion at preſent exiſting, would have ſtated the inſtances wherein it was deficient I can find only two even ſuggeſted, the one of peace and war including treaties, the other of a regency.

As to peace and war, which the noble Lord in his adoption of Mr. Pitt's aſſertions relies upon, he ſhould recollect that the ſole and abſolute right of making either reſts in the executive power, it is the King's prerogative. I need not ſhew that by law the executive is and ever muſt be the ſame, and with the ſame conſtitutional powers, in each kingdom. The prerogative not being conferred by ſtatute law, has and ever muſt have equal powers in each, when not controuled by law. Separate legiſlatures don't affect the executive, where he acts independent of the authority of legiſlation; but from the balance of power to which the Britiſh Conſtitution owes its great excellence, the executive, though veſted with power to act by declaring war, is forced to apply to Parliament for the means to carry it on, and therefore muſt conſult their opinion and aſk their advice. Suppoſe then the Britiſh Parliament to approve a war, and that of Ireland to diſapprove, the only difficulty which this difference of ſentiment could create would be, that the

the one who diſapproved, might withhold its ſupplies until good ſenſe ſhould induce it to acquieſce. It could not by the refuſal ſtand clear of the miſeries, and hazards, and loſſes of war, becauſe the King's declaration involves it equally as Britain.

As to peace, no refuſal of ſupplies could there inconvenience or embarraſs the executive, nor is it likely that any nation, much leſs the ſmaller, could ever decline to receive the bleſſing of peace, when the Sovereign ſhould offer it;—any difference therefore of conduct in ſeparate Legiſlatures, however unpleaſant, could create no real difficulty there. Thus neither peace nor war neceſſarily requires the act of either Legiſlature, and their ſeparate powers form no conſtitutional difficulty.

As to treaties, which neither concern peace or war, but are merely commercial, and therefore may require the aid of legiſlative acts to confirm them, or in other words, to impoſe duties, prohibitions, or reſtrictions in trade. I am not read enough in the Conſtitutional doctrine, on which the Executive can pledge itſelf to a foreign power, for any act to be done by the Legiſlature, of which it is only a third eſtate; but of this I am ſure, there is not ſo much reaſon to apprehend that the Iriſh Parliament ſhould differ from the Britiſh, as there is to ſuppoſe, that the Britiſh might differ from the Executive; the latter caſe is equally poſſible as the other; and not having ever been guarded againſt, and being indeed incapable of being guarded againſt, the former may ſafely reſt on the ſame footing. The argument which ſuggeſts the difficulty is entirely theoretic, and many things which appear difficult, or even hazardous in theory, are not only ſafe, but even reconciled in practice.

Theory

Theory ſays, the Parliament may diſagree with the King in his declaration of peace and war, or in his treaties; but in the courſe of the Britiſh hiſtory, how often has it diſagreed, and have any, and what, national injuries followed ſuch diſagreement? It would be difficult to find them; never, I believe, ſince the Conſtitution has been the happy one it now is.

Theory ſays, the two Houſes may, in legiſlative acts of material neceſſity, diſagree with each other; and therefore, would you venture to prevent the evil, by an abſurd and impracticable attempt to force one to ſurrender its liberty to the other; or in the faſhionable phraſe, by conſolidating them both into one great maſs of wiſdom, united ſtrength, and increaſed power?

Theory, and theory only ſays, the ſame of the ſeparate Parliaments of the two kingdoms; and there is no one argument you can apply for the neceſſity of conſolidating them, that will not apply much ſtronger for the conſolidation of the two Houſes in each;—and the ſame arguments will all further apply, with equal ſtrength, to conſolidate the two Houſes after ſuch junction, with the King, as the third eſtate, for fear of the national concerns being impeded by their diſagreeing with him, or he with them,—and thus your arguments will end in the abſurdity, that you muſt conſolidate the three eſtates of each kingdom into one, for fear of an inconvenience from a difference of opinion ariſing from the exerciſe of their free judgment; that you muſt abandon the glorious Conſtitution of a mixed government, which you now enjoy, and adopt that of a ſingle Monarch, or ſingle power, wherever it may reſt, either in a Monarch, or a Republick, or an Oligarchy. But practice, which is a more ſteady guide than theory, tells you

the

the reverſe. In points of peace and war, the Iriſh Parliament has never, even during centuries, differed in opinion from the Britiſh, though its power to do ſo has ever been as unlimited, and equally free before, as ſince the Conſtitution of 1782. No,—Intereſt is a ſure guide to nations, and it never was, nor never can be the intereſt of the ſmaller number, to differ from the larger, of the weaker to differ from the more powerful on ſuch a matter; and it is no raſh prediction to ſay, that good ſenſe and even neceſſity muſt ſoon reconcile the differing body, if unfortunately ſuch an inſtance ſhould ever happen.

But if we look into the principles of the Britiſh Conſtitution, we ſhall there find abundant reaſon not only to reject the arguments of ſuch a theory as would conſolidate the legiſlatures, but even not to adopt it if it were practicable. That Conſtitution was not the work of one man or of one age, it has gradually been ſoftened down in the courſe of centuries into the perfection we now enjoy it, more by the colliſion of circumſtances than by the efforts of human wiſdom or foreſight.

That colliſion has imperceptibly formed a balance in its conſtituent parts, which by the power of mutual checks, keeps each within its bounds, and preſerves the whole in its true perfection.

That balancing check is the true principle to which it owes its preſervation; deſtroy it, and the whole is gone. Is it wrong then to look to ſimilar good effects from the ſame balancing principle in the connexion between the legiſlatures of the two iſlands, as in the connexion between the component parts of each legiſlature?

If it keeps the three eſtates of Parliament together all in their juſt proportion in each kingdom, why not depend on the ſame principle operating the ſame way, and keeping the two legiſlatures of both kingdoms in their juſt relations to each other, ſo as that their mixed powers, like thoſe of the mixed government, ſhall by their ſeparate exertion ſo checked, preſerve the ſymmetry and union of the whole machine of the empire, which a theoretic or unwiſe merging of the one into the other, might ſo affect as to render incapable of working?

No man is wiſe enough to foreſee all the conſequences of changing ſyſtem even in ſmall affairs, much leſs can he in ſuch a ſtupendous work, as the conſtitution of a great empire; and if it goes on practically even with ſome, or if you pleaſe with great ſpeculative imperfections; he is a raſh ſtateſman who would venture to change its progreſs, even on the plauſible ſuggeſtions of a clear and perſuaſive theory; but here there is none ſuch; and even if there were, how often is the beſt theory defeated by practice? We may find many inſtances; I will give you one. Juries from the vicinage are liable to all the prejudices, animoſities, friendſhips, which thoſe from a remoter country would be free from; and looking to the theory of juſtice only, we ſhould never have choſen them from the neighbourhood, yet the experience of a thouſand years thro' every change the conſtitution has undergone, has proved that the very matter from which we might have apprehended the imperfection of this mode of trial is its great and peculiar excellence. Mr. Pitt, on the ſame theory, tells us that our Parliaments may be influenced by local prejudices and partialities, from reſiding in the country, whoſe intereſts are to come before it, and therefore he would ſend thoſe intereſts to a foreign Parliament, who know nothing of them

them nor can have the ſame means of knowledge I reply to him, that the practice of juries ſhews—that the local knowledge is the very eſſence of its capability to adminiſter its functions.

It would be endleſs to run into all the caſes wherin practice is a better monitor than theory—in none is it more ſo, than in the policy of governing mankind, and in no age or at no period is it more particularly worthy of being deemed ſo than in the preſent, when ſo many metaphyſic reſearches and theoretic plans of meliorating governments and reforming ſyſtems which have ſtood the ſtorms of ages, have convulſed and deſolated the faireſt countries of Europe. Look away then from the preſent project, however decorated with the powers of eloquence, and turn your eyes to the hiſtory and practice of your own country;—that country whoſe ſafety at this inſtant is endangered by a theoretic propoſal to reform the ſyſtem of its conſtitution, at the time that it is working with eaſe and increaſing benefit.

Has the Iriſh Parliament in peace or war, or in treaties, ſince we have any records of its proceedings, clogged the progreſs of the Empire, by holding a different opinion from the Britiſh?—more particularly, ſince the reſtoration of its independence rouſed in it the pride, the ſpirit, and the ſenſe of honour, which always attends true liberty, has it through peace, or war, ever differed from the Britiſh, or been leſs zealous in improving the one, and proſecuting the other?—From that period to this day the times have been peculiarly marked with great and trying events, and will afford us numerous examples of concurrence; none of difference, except you call the Regency ſuch.—In every one then in which Ireland could ſhew its opinion,

nion, that opinion has been to ſupport and ſtrengthen Britain, to adopt the ſame regulations, to confer the ſame powers. Look to the many regulations in the commercial ſyſtem, navigation act, manifeſt act, intercourſe with the United States, treaty with France, expiration of the Eaſt India Charter and the arrangement of trade there.

But the noble Lord has told us the real motives of this ſcheme of Union, and I thank him for ſtating them ſo fairly. Ireland, he ſays, muſt contribute to every war, and the Miniſter won't truſt to intereſt, affection, or connexion, for guiding her conduct. He muſt have her purſe within his own graſp. While three hundred men hold it in Ireland, he cannot put his hand into it, they are out of his reach—but let one hundred of you carry it over and lay it at his feet, and then he will have the full and uncontrouled power.

What though you have given eight millions this year, a greater ſum than any proportion of calculation calls for, yet it is no part of his finance ſyſtem, and you may not do it hereafter when it might be a breach of truſt in you to give it.

Finance ſo occupies his mind, that it is the ruling principle of all his meaſures, it attended the commercial ſyſtem in the ſhape of a ſupply for imperial concerns—and if you could contrive now to give him the purſe of the nation, without extinguiſhing your Parliament, believe me you would hear no more of Union. I reſpect him perſonally—I look on him as the greateſt miniſter for finance that ever exiſted in any country, but in this fatal project of a Union, I do not ſcruple to ſay, he is the worſt miniſter Ireland ever met.

If

If a ſimilarity of laws be, an eſſential means of Union, it is already attained and zealouſly continued by the voluntary acts of both kingdoms.—But the noble Lord wants more, he wants your purſe and your trade, for the only queſtion of imperial concern, (the Regency excepted) which he has ſtated, and the only one which Mr. Pitt, in his ſpeech has attempted even to ſuggeſt, is this of war and treaty; and the only difficulty relied on, as to war, is the want of power to tax you, and the only legiſlative act for treaties is to reſtrain or regulate trade, and thus the whole truth is diſcovered.

He wants a Union, in order to tax you and take your money where he fears your own repreſentatives would deem it improper, and to force regulations on your trade, which your own Parliament would conſider injurious or partial.—I never expected to have heard it ſo unequivocally acknowledged, and I truſt that it will be thoroughly underſtood, that it is not your Conſtitution he wants to take away for any ſuppoſed imperfection, but becauſe it keeps the purſe of the nation in the honeſt hands of an Iriſh Parliament.

I have mentioned the Regency in 1789. Unfortunate as it was that the two countries differed, the difference was not as to the perſon, but as to the limitations of power; nor was it properly ſpeaking, the Parliaments that differed; it was the two eſtates, deprived of the third eſtate, which equally belonged to each Parliament, and in an inſtance wherein the controul of the Britiſh Council over that eſtate in its power of aſſenting or diſſenting with the two houſes of Ireland, was by the fatality of the caſe neceſſarily extinguiſhed,—and I rely on it that if his Majeſty's unfortunate illneſs had continued, all differences which marked the conduct of the two Houſes here and thoſe in Britain muſt have been

done away, the moment that the controul I have ſtated ſhould be eſtabliſhed by the Great Seal being again put into exerciſe.

Let me again advert to this circumſtance, for it is a moſt impreſſive proof of the efficacy of that connexion which the adjuſtment of 1782 eſtabliſhed in regard to the Great Seal of Britain, and which I have detailed already.

It ſhews, that the only inſtance, which the advocates of Union produce, happened when the bond of Union which 1782 eſtabliſhed, was ſuſpended from operating; and this is a powerful argument in favour of this bond.

But I ſay, that no real difficulty does exiſt. For it is clear, notwithſtanding what paſſed in 1789; that the act annexing the Crown in Hen. 8. extends to the perſon authoriſed by Britain to adminiſter regal power, whether King, Queen, or Regent. At the Revolution, the Britiſh Parliament altered the ſucceſſion to the Crown, and when the event took place, the ſucceſſor became our Sovereign through their Act under ours of Hen. 8. and ſo would a Regent inveſted by them with regal authority become ours without any Act on our part. Our law of 1782 concerning the Great Seal puts it out of doubt; whoever is Regent of Britain has that Great Seal, the functions of the Iriſh Legiſlature muſt ceaſe without its uſe, and therefore the Regent of Britain alone can repreſent the 3d eſtate of the Iriſh Legiſlature. The identity of the perſon, that the ſame perſon ſhall neceſſarily be the Regent in both kingdoms is the eſſential point—the Act of Annexation and 1782 ſecure this; and if local circumſtance require any difference of power, either enabling or diſabling, the Iriſh Parliament will be equally competent to eſtabliſh it, under the

the Regent, as it is now to eſtabliſh any difference if neceſſary under the Sovereign.

But ſuppoſe doubts ſtill continue, nay go farther, and ſuppoſe, contrary to all reaſon, that the preſent Bill cannot remove them, we ſhould be idiots if we were for a caſualty which may never happen, and for a diſagreement which may not attend that caſualty, and for the very ſlight, and trifling, and temporary, and theoretic inconveniencies which might be the conſequences of ſuch diſagreement, to ſacrifice our free Conſtitution, degrade the country into the ſtate almoſt of a colony, and ſurrender that legiſlative independence which, in the very act of ſurrendering, we ſhould ſhew ourſelves unworthy of enjoying.

One argument which the advocates for the Union urge is, that it will augment the general force of the empire. Were it calculated to produce that effect, we ought to ſacrifice much to ſuch an attainment, but do they prove it? no, nor even attempt an argument, they give general terms, pompous phraſes and unſupported aſſertions, and ſpeak of us as if there were no Union, as if we were actually ſeparate, and then attribute to their project every merit, every advantage which we now enjoy, as if they could confer them, and as if they did not exiſt. The caſe is, we are now united, ſo as if our whole ſtrength is the ſtrength of the empire. And as to reſources againſt the enemy, the conſolidation of both kingdoms is as firm as human policy and individual intereſt can make it.

Conſider the meaſure what it really is, a merging of the Iriſh Parliament into the Britiſh, and the conſequent removal of it to Britain; that is all, it is no otherwiſe a Union; it is ſimply the leaving Ireland without the reſidence of a Parliament.

ment. This is the whole of the mighty project which is to do ſuch wonders, and in plain Engliſh the mighty wonder ends in this, to leave us in every reſpect exactly as we are, except as to our Parliament. Will its removal raiſe one ſoldier or one guinea more? will it encreaſe the capacity of doing either?—On the contrary, by debilitating Ireland, by debaſing its ſpirit, and draining it of the leading fortunes and talents of the Country, by creating an encreaſe of abſentees, by checking trade and manufacture, it muſt weaken our reſources; and inſtead of the energy and zeal of a free people offering their lives and their properties, the empire will at moſt have the tardy and inanimated ſupport of a diſpirited and diſcontented province.

When Mr. Pitt ſays, If we were to aſk the agent of our enemies, what meaſure would be moſt likely to render their deſigns abortive, the anſwer would be the firm conſolidation of every part of the empire, I would bid him tell thoſe enemies it is and has been conſolidated, I would bid him do this, inſtead of holding us out as he does through his whole ſpeech to the viſitation of the enemy, by ſtating us as the vulnerable part of the empire, torn by contending factions. It is painful to go through all the phraſes in which he inſults our feelings, and which every Iriſhman knows not to be founded, I will omit repeating them, and aſk you—Can we ſee in this repeated and open ſtatement, the ſound diſcretion which has marked his progreſs as a ſtateſman in moſt of his other meaſures? He knew the aſſent of Ireland would be neceſſary to his preſent ſcheme, ſuppoſing it as ſalutary, wiſe, and practicable as he ſtates it: ſhould he then in common policy have held out our weakneſſes even if real, and aſſert with all the impreſſive force of language that thoſe weakneſſes muſt continue if we ſhould refuſe our aſſent, before he knew we were ready to give it?

Providence

Providence has been often a kind friend to Ireland, and it is our good fortune now, that the enemy knows we are not in the ſtate he paints us. They will not be impoſed on—they know and feel that we are firmly united to Great Britain in affection and in intereſt, and they will pay no regard to the manner in which Municipal Laws cement or qualify that Union. If they have ſecret aſſiſtants in this kingdom, they are not ſo ſenſeleſs as not to know that a roll of parchment won't change their minds, or remove them from the means of giving the expected aid;—on the contrary, if they entertain any hope of ſucceſs, will they not think that the affections, intereſts, united reſources, and united ſtrength of thoſe parts of the Empire, cannot be ſtrengthened by ſuch a roll,—but that the leaving ſo large a kingdom without a Legiſlature, whoſe energy they felt to their great diſcomfiture in their late attempts to promote rebellion, will give their ſecret friends more power to act? Was it wiſe by a haſty and immature propoſal to riſk the miſconception which a watchful enemy might be led into, by an aſſertion that no real Union ever exiſted?

But the argument is ſtill more inapplicable; the danger he threatens us with is inſtant; and the meaſure for our protection, the Union, muſt be a work of time. He tells the enemy the danger and the remedy, the danger immediate, the remedy diſtant. He deſtroys a Conſtitution which we hold, as the dear and ſacred Palladium of our liberty, and would perſuade the world there will be more zeal in Ireland, when that Conſtitution no longer ſhall remain, to animate its ſpirit and invigorate its exertions.

Another advantage mentioned by the advocates of the meaſure is ſtill more ſtrange, and if poſſible couched in more general

general terms without ſpecifying any particular inſtance by which or on which the operation is to have effect.

That it will tranquilliſe Ireland.—It is again diſguſting to me as an Iriſhman, to repeat all the inſulting epithets and phraſes with which he deſcribes the ſtate of this Country: —If a reſident Parliament and reſident gentry cannot ſoften the manners, amend the habits, or promote ſocial intercourſe, will no Parliament, and fewer reſident gentry, do it? What is the great misfortune with reſpect to the tenantry of this kingdom? the middlemen, who intervene between the owner and the actual occupier, and theſe are moſtly to be found on the eſtates of abſentees. I have ever underſtood, that the example of the upper ranks, was the moſt effectual means of promoting good morals and habits among the lower orders; that their attention to the education, the health, and the comforts, as well as the protection they afforded the lower ranks, all which can only ariſe from reſidence were the ſureſt mode of conciliating their affections, as well as improving their manners; that if every eſtate and every village afforded a benevolent protector, an eaſy and impartial diſpenſer of juſtice, and allayer of the little feuds which headſtrong paſſions, untamed by education, are too apt to carry to the laſt exceſſes, the lower orders would learn not only obedience and veneration to the laws, but would feel an attachment to the country which afforded them ſuch bleſſings—but it has remained for Mr. Pitt to advance a new ſyſtem, that depriving a country of thoſe perſons whom I have deſcribed, encouraging land-jobbers and land-pirates, degrading the hoſpitality of the old manſion-houſes into the niggardly penury of agent's dwellings, is the moſt approved, modern mode of making happy and contented tenants, of forming good men and good ſubjects.

That

That the adding to the biſhop's duty of attending to his dioceſe, the new and imperial duty of quitting the kingdom for eight months in the year, is the beſt way to make him acquainted with his clergy, and of enforcing their attention to their pariſhioners.

That a Parliament unacquainted with the local circumſtances of a kingdom which it never ſees—at too great a diſtance to receive communication or information for adminiſtering in time to the wants or the wiſhes of the people, or to guard againſt exceſſes or diſcontents, is more capable of acting beneficially than the one, who by being on the ſpot, and acquainted with the habits, prejudices, and diſpoſition of their fellow ſubjects, beſt know how to apply relief.

But if we advert to the treaſons and rebellions which have ſo degraded this Country, there we can apply to fact,—Could any Parliament ſitting in Great Britain have developed the ſecret ſyſtem of conſpiracy, animated the loyal, and ſupported the executive, with the effect this very Parliament did? what would the ridiculous exhibition have been at that time, of a united Parliament walking through St. James's Park with their addreſs, and yet what vigour and energy did the inſtant proceſſion of near two hundred members with the mace to the caſtle, give to the loyal ardour of the country,—it animated the loyal ſpirit which cruſhed the rebellion before a ſingle ſoldier could arrive from England, notwithſtanding the uncommon exertions made there to expedite their ſailing.

The extraordinary, but wiſe and neceſſary meaſure of proclaiming martial law, required the concurrence of Parliament to ſupport the executive. The time would have paſt by, before that concurrence could have been aſked for, and

received from London; and it would have given a faint ſupport, coming from ſtrangers, compared with the impreſſion of its ſpringing from Iriſhmen, all liable to every danger and inconvenience from its operation, and yielding themſelves and their properies to its control.

Recollect the volunteers, the ſaviours of the Country and terror of its enemies; when their great work was effected, and by the indiſcreetneſs of a few leaders, their zeal was miſled, and they began to exerciſe the functions of Parliament, we ſpoke out firmly—they heard our voice with effect, and took our advice in inſtantly returning to cultivate the bleſſings of peace. I aſk you, would equal firmneſs in a Parliament, compoſed five parts in ſix of ſtrangers, ſitting in another country, have had the ſame effect? You know it would not. Perſonal character, reſpect to individuals, opinion of their attachment to one common country, all impreſſed an awe which was irreſiſtible.

But how has tranquillity been preſerved in Britain? Don't the ſecret reports ſhew that France has a ſanguine hope of ſeparating Scotland as well as Ireland, though ſhe carries the charm of Union to protect her; that even in England there are conſpiracies, and I will put this queſtion to any man who conſiders the reports of their Parliament and ours—have they probed the conſpiracy to the bottom as we have done? Is it a vain ſuppoſition, that if Scotland had had its Parliament ſitting in Edinburgh, the conſpiracy which ſpread ſo widely would have been ſooner developed, and not ſhewn itſelf again there after it had been put down here?

Need I go to more inſtances to ſhew you how tranquillity has been ſecured, and diſturbances prevented by the interpoſition of this Iriſh Parliament which you are called upon for the ſake of preſerving tranquillity to tranſport out of your kingdom,

kingdom, to treat like the traitors and rebels who plotted to have deſtroyed your country? I feel it would be waſte of time.—No, no, cheriſh the Parliament that was able and willing to ſave you. All natives of one country, their ſtake is in it; their hearts as well as their intereſts are engaged in its preſervation, its proſperity, and its glory.

But you are to be improved into Britiſh manners and Britiſh cuſtoms! Idle talk; much as I admire Britain, I am not ready to give up the Iriſh character or to make a ſacrifice for the change. But is it by Engliſhmen coming here that the change is to be effected? I anſwer, how will the tranſporting our Legiſlature, our men of fortune, and men of talents invite them? will men come with a view of profit to ſettle in a country, at a moment when the principal cuſtomers, who may be in their contemplation, are in the act of leaving that country and going to them? Look to the immenſe reſidence now in your kingdom from the unuſual number of Britiſh officers, ſoldiers, and thoſe of the Engliſh militia particularly, becauſe the privates afford the example of manners and civilization to the claſſes which are in moſt want of them here. Will the Union bring ſo many or diffuſe them ſo generally? in war they come without it, in peace they cannot come as ſoldiers.

Look to Scotland which has been united near a century, look to Wales which has been united above five centuries. Have Engliſh manners and Engliſh habits been able ever to get the Engliſh language into full uſe? and if they have not put down the native language, are new habits which ariſe from ſocial intercourſe to be communicated by perſons who cannot underſtand each other when they ſpeak? after forty years experience, they were forced to have recourſe to the compulſion of law to put down the Highland dreſs, yet even that has been ineffectual to extinguiſh the national attachment to it, the truth is, the manners of a people can-

not be changed in a country ſuddenly. Great advances have already been made by wholeſome laws towards meliorating them here; they have been for years in a ſtate of progreſs towards improvement; this progreſs muſt not be hurried, or you check it. Encourage the reſidence of the rich, cheriſh and maintain that free Conſtitution, that Independence, without which no country is worth living in. In an iſland bleſt with ſoil, climate, and ſituation beyond moſt iſlands in the globe, induſtry and wealth muſt encreaſe, and if you will but abſtain from experiment, civilization and meliorated manners will be the ſure attendants.

He tells you, his project will diffuſe Britiſh wealth, and induce Britiſh capital to ſettle here, but he does not tell you how or why, becauſe he cannot. What practical difference in the actual ſtate of the country will his Union occaſion, to induce an Engliſhman to ſettle here, or what encouragement will it hold out to him, which is not at this very inſtant in exiſtence? taxes won't be lowered; the whole object of the meaſure is to raiſe them; it has been explicitly ſtated ſo, and they are in a pretty rapid ſtate of progreſſion already. The ſame vague and idle bombaſt of expreſſion, of aſſertion without proof, is made uſe of here.—Mr. Pitt ſays, it will give to Ireland the common uſe of the Britiſh capital—will identify Ireland with England, and ſo forth; theſe general unſupported expreſſions have no meaning, and we will examine the ſubject minutely.

I will firſt go through the particulars of the trade and manufactures of each kingdom to ſhew you the abſurdity and futility of aſſerting, that a Legiſlative Union will bring capital into Ireland.

With regard to manufactures, thoſe which employ the capital of Britain, and are of courſe the moſt profitable, are the Woollen, Cotton, Iron and Pottery. The two latter depend

ſo

ſo totally on plenty and cheapneſs of fuel, that they exiſt only in the coal countries, and have never have been known even in England to make what can be called a ſettlement at any diſtance from a plentiful colliery, and fire is ſo great a portion of their expence, that the part of the country which affords it beſt and cheapeſt, muſt have ſuch a decided preference, as to induce any looſe capital, if there be any ſuch, to veſt itſelf there. In the iron manufacture, Ireland has offered an encouragement ſuperior to Britain. Her duty on imported iron is 12s. 6d. per ton, the Britiſh near 3l. which operates as a bounty of above 40s. a ton to the manufacturer in Ireland, yet this bounty has not brought capital into Ireland, and we muſt expect an equilization of thoſe duties, when our legiſlature ſhall be extinguiſhed, whereby this bounty will be extinguiſhed alſo. The export of iron wrought to Ireland on the average of the laſt three years, was in value 119,000l. all ſubject when unrated to at leaſt 12l. 14s. per cent. In the pottery too, the flint and clay which is ſo abundant in England has not yet been found in any quantity in Ireland, and in fact there is not a ſingle pottery in Ireland.

It is ſelf-evident, therefore, that theſe manufactures never can travel from the country which has the coal, to that which has it not, from Britain to Ireland. The ſame facility of fuel muſt give to Britain a decided preference in all manufactures, where ſteam-engines cheapen the price of labour.

As to the woollens, look at Yorkſhire, their old and great ſettlement; though eſtabliſhed there for centuries they have never travelled in any direction ten miles from the coal country. Leeds, Bradford, Halifax, and the circuit around the eaſt north and ſouth of the ſeat of manufacture, theſe ſupport me in what I aſſert, as if nature had drawn a line

on

on the ſurface, as in the ſubterraneous ſtratum, and ſaid, thu far ſhall you go, an dno farther.

The late introduction of machinery by ſteam, which not only cheapens labour, but improves the quality beyond manual operation, adds argument to fact, and therefore we can never ſuppoſe ſound ſpeculation would ſend any capital to the diſtance of Ireland acroſs the ſeas, when it has not ſent it ten miles in England. But great as the conſideration of fuel is to any man in forming ſpeculations to extend himſelf in this buſineſs, there are others ſo obvious that they cannot be overlooked.

England finds a full call for all ſhe makes, every year affords an increaſing demand; ſuppoſe a man there ſpeculates to veſt more capital in the buſineſs; to ſettle a ſon; a nephew or a brother in it. Will he not prefer the extenſion on his own ſpot within his view, and under his direct controul, to attempting it in a new and diſtant country? but of all countries would he in common ſenſe look to that which comes to him for the very goods he makes, which offers him their market at his own door, without trouble riſque or change?

Would he not ſay to himſelf, the place I live in muſt make the goods as much cheaper than the Iriſh can, as the whole expence of carriage, and import duties which Ireland charges, will amount to.

He would find theſe duties 7dh. a yard on old drapery or woollen cloth, operating as 8⅓ per cent. on a cloth of 7s. 6d. a yard in value, and 2dh. on new drapery, or ſtuffs, ſerges, durants, &c. operating as 8⅓ per cent. on 2s. 6d. a yard, and he would naturally wiſh to ſee what great and countervailing inducements this meaſure of Union holds out to him before he ventures on his ſpeculation. Suppoſe

poſe he applies to the Miniſter for information, he will hear from him, 'it conſolidates intereſt, it gives a full participation of all the commerce of Britain; it identifies the two countries into one; it diffuſes common wealth,'—well, all this is fine language which I don't underſtand; but what does it do as to my trade? Is it to increaſe the duties there, ſo as to hinder more goods going from England? 'No, look to the 6th Propoſition, they are never to be raiſed, and they are even to ceaſe in time.'

Will it find fuel for me there? 'No.' What then does it do? 'Why it does every thing: it removes their Parliament here,'—worſe and worſe, he would ſay, I have found my trade nurtured and encouraged by Parliament, and you want to ſend me to a country without a Parliament, no. If you will ſend the Britiſh Parliament to Ireland, I might then think of going there, for where the Parliament is, there ſhould the manufacturer be alſo: until then, you ſhall not induce me by impoſing phraſes to hazard my capital in a country, whoſe market I fully enjoy at my own warehouſe, without offering me any one reaſon why my neighbour, whom I leave behind me, won't underſell me, even to my preſent cuſtomers there, as I now underſell all the Iriſh makers to them. No no, I ſee your plan, you want to impoſe on the Iriſh Nation. If they are fools let them be ſo, but I won't be your dupe, nor your inſtrument.

Suppoſe he were even to perſiſt farther, and giving up the idea of ſupplying the home conſumption of Ireland, he ſhould look to ſupplying foreign markets from Ireland, when he ſhould ſettle his capital, his machinery and his workmen here; he might ſay, you talked to me of Ireland's being to enjoy hereafter a full participation of the Britiſh commerce, and if I go there, I may export from thence. 'Yes that is one great advantage from the meaſure.' Then, I ſuppoſe the Iriſh are prohibited now from exporting

to

to foreign markets. 'No, they have had a full and free liberty to do ſo theſe twenty years paſt.' The Union then gives a bounty I ſuppoſe on export? 'No, that would be unfair,' and ſo you only offer me the ſame freedom which Ireland has enjoyed without avail for theſe 20 years paſt, and which I can enjoy from my own ports, and you don't remove the diſadvantage which now enhances the price of the fabrick in Ireland ſo as to force her home market to be ſupplied from Britain, and which enhanced price muſt equally prevent her from meeting the Britiſh at a foreign market.

Were he further to look into the ſtate of the trade and enquire into the progreſs of the export of woollen cloth from Ireland, he would find that in 1698, they exported 110,207l. in value (one-fifth of all their exports) and in 1798, 12,500l. only.—Were he to examine in Britain, it would appear that ten years ago ſhe exported in woollen manufacture to the whole world 4,368,936l. in value and in the laſt year 6,836,603l. that out of the former there went to Ireland 353,781l. and out of the latter 580,723l. ſo that in ten years the encreaſed export was one-third to all the world, and more than one-third to Ireland. He would further find on enquiry that Ireland exported no unmanufactured wool; it worked up all it had, and there was little reaſon to ſuppoſe the quantity would be enlarged, as the great encreaſe of agriculture and of the linen manufacture gave a better profit in land than ſheep afforded, ſo that Ireland could not even ſupply him with wool to work and if he were to aſk the miniſter is Britiſh wool to follow him there, it is obvious what would be the reply.

Need I add further, to expoſe the abſurdity of ſuch a poſition as that of the Union bringing over Britiſh capital to eſtabliſh Woollen, Iron or Pottery manufacturers?—The caſe of the Cotton is not leſs ſtrong. We cannot even on the eaſtern coaſt of Ireland oppoſite the Britiſh

Britiſh collieries make cotton twiſt within at leaſt 20 per cent. as cheap as Britain can ſupply us, and we do not at this inſtant make ſufficient for the neceſſary conſumption of the kingdom.—Machinery is more uſed in this manufacture than the others, and one circumſtance reſpecting it is worth obſervation: In Britain it was for years ſubject to a heavy charge, I have heard to 2s. 6d. a ſpindle annually, for Arkwright's Patent, from which it always was entirely free in Ireland; yet not a penny ever came from England to ſet up that machinery here, though the patent operated as a bounty to encourage the erection of it. I underſtand that patent has expired within theſe few years, and if no capital came, if no Engliſhman thought the ſpeculation good while that bounty exiſted, it is nonſenſe to ſuppoſe he will think it a better ſpeculation when the bounty has ceaſed. If the imports of Britiſh cotton manufacture were to be examined, it would appear that Britain in 1789 exported to Ireland to the value only of 32,500l. and in 1798, 107,293l. though ſubject to a duty of above 12 per cent in general.

But to ſave entering into more detail, I will adduce the arguments and authority of the ſame gentleman, Mr. Pitt, in 1785, though he now maintains a different opinion, and holds out the idle phraſe of Diffuſion of Britiſh Capital. In ſpeaking of the memorable propoſitions he ſays:

'That beſides the different degrees of the induſtry of 'the two nations, he was well informed and ſuf- 'ficiently convinced that the rate of wages as well as of la- 'bour, was greater in Ireland than in England, in any 'branch of manufacture which required execution and inge- 'nuity; inſtancing a gentleman whom he deſcribed to be the 'firſt and the principal perſon in the cotton buſineſs in Ire- 'land (Major Brooke) who was ſeveral times in danger of 'loſing his life, becauſe he refuſed to allow his workmen a

'greater

'greater price than they had at Manchester. He could not 'help obſerving, that the fears and apprehenſions of the ma- 'nufacturers were extremely far fetched, and ill founded, nor 'did it appear to him that there were ſuch grounds for them 'as ought to weigh with any reaſonable man. They had 'declared themſelves to be under great anxiety and uneaſi- 'neſs, leſt the Iriſh in conſequence of this arrangement, 'ſhould be able to draw over all their workmen, all their 'trade, and all their capitals, and be able to underſell them 'in their own markets by at leaſt 13l. per cent. Now he 'deſired the committee to attend to that ſingle ſubject; the 'Iriſh cotton trade was to be imported into England accord- 'ing to this plan at 10 and one-half per cent. duty, and yet 'it was ſaid they were to underſell the Engliſh manufacturer '13l. per cent. Theſe two ſums amounted to 23 and a half 'per cent; beſides this, England had hitherto imported into 'Ireland at a duty of 10 and a half per cent; this, there- 'fore, added to the other two ſums would amount to 34l. 'per cent.' And again, 'he moſt earneſtly entreated the 'Houſe not to ſuffer themſelves to be carried away with the 'idea that a poor country, merely becauſe ſhe enjoyed ſome 'comparative exemption from taxes, was therefore able to 'cope with a rich and powerful country; the fact, he was 'ready to contend, was by no means ſo.'

I will to his authority add that of another gentleman, then a Commoner, now Lord Grenville, who, ſpeaking of the opinion that the cheapneſs of proviſions would enable the Iriſh to underſell the Engliſh manufacturer at his own door, ſaid 'But 'the noble Lord (North) brought no proof of this, indeed it 'would have been wonderful if he had, for nobody knew 'where to find any ſuch proof. On the contrary it had been 'proved at the bar by a very reſpectable gentleman, Capt. 'Brooke, who had ſet up an extenſive cotton manufactory in 'Ireland, that he had always given the ſame wages that were

'given

" given at Mancheſter, and that he had on more occaſions
" than one, with difficulty eſcaped with his life from his
" workmen, who had confederated in order to compel
" him to raiſe their wages higher, than thoſe that were
" paid at Mancheſter. So far no greater cheapneſs of
" labour appeared in one country than in the other, but
" ſuppoſing the wages were ſomewhat lower in Ireland
" than in England, he could not admit that, as a proof
" that labour was in fact cheaper, for the true way to eſti-
" mate that point would be to ſee what work was done for
" the money, and if the work was not proportioned or
" equal to the price, then labour could not be ſaid to be
" as low as from the wages it might appear to be."

If then Britiſh capital wont come to eſtabliſh thoſe manufactures in which Britain excels us, and ſupplies us, it will be fair to examine whether the Union will bring it to that Manufacture in which we do certainly underſell England, and poſſeſs natural advantages ſhe does not, I mean the linen, for if Britiſh capital could be induced over, here is an article obvious to invite it. But what has been the fact? It has been free and proſperous for theſe ninety years, and has afforded many great fortunes to the induſtrious who have engaged in it; yet hardly any Britiſh capital has ſettled here in it. (I ſpeak not of trifling capitals, nor of Wakefield or any other perſons who have almoſt inſtantly diſappeared) and if none have come to remain, while it has been cheriſhed and ſupported by large grants and beneficial laws from the Iriſh Parliament, will it come when that natural and protecting guardian is no more? Will Mr. Pitt's threats to refuſe it the Britiſh market induce ſettlers here? Will its great progreſs in Britain invite men to quit the profits it affords there, merely to make equal profits here? No, the fact of no Britiſh capital having ſettled here gives a ſtronger anſwer

than any arguments can, to all the idle theory that is held out to deceive us; and I will conclude this ſubject by obſerving that if Britiſh capital has not come here to a manufacture which we do work as cheap as Britain can, much leſs will it come to manufactures in which they underſell us in our own home in deſpite of duties and freight.

If then this fooliſh aſſertion, that the Union will induce Britain to veſt her capital in this country on manufactures for home conſumption, falls to the ground, we will examine whether it can induce them to do ſo for the ſupply of foreign markets, and one ſimple anſwer will be deciſive, that if they can underſell us at home in any manufacture, they muſt do it abroad and therefore the ſpeculation is abſurd.

And it is equally abſurd to ſuppoſe any will come to deal in foreign articles of import; but ſuppoſe a perſon willing to venture, he muſt import either for home uſe, or for re-export; if for home, inſtead of an acquiſition he will be an injury by encreaſing an import to the prejudice of our manufactures, and if for re-export, I might ſay with Adam Smith, there is little benefit thereby to Ireland, but let Mr. Pitt give him a full anſwer as follows:

To the queſtion, is it likely Ireland is to become the emporium, the mart of the Empire, as it is ſaid ſhe would, he replies, "he did not believe that would ever "be the caſe, by emporium he means, that Ireland would "import the produce of Africa and America, afterwards "to diſtribute it to all the world, and to Britain among "the reſt. No ſuch conſequence could ariſe, Ireland "did not covet the ſupply of the foreign markets, "nor was it probable that ſhe would furniſh Britain with "the produce of her own colonies in any great degree. "Ireland was to have the liberty of bringing to Britain

"cir-

" circuitouſly, what ſhe herſelf had the liberty of bring-
" ing directly. It muſt be proved that Ireland could
" afford this circuitous ſupply, cheaper than Britain her-
" ſelf could give the direct ſupply, before any idea, or
" alarm, or apprehenſion could be raiſed in any boſom."

But we are told in the ſame glaring parade of general aſſertion that this project will give us a full participation of all the extended commerce, and with it of all the wealth of Britain, the greateſt and proudeſt country under Heaven; that ſhe offers a full partnerſhip. Why Sir, this talk might do to People who are ignorant, but let me tell you and no man can contradict me, that we are as free to trade to all the world as Britain is at this moment, and that if the Miniſter was to aſk me what benefit he could offer, what trade he could open, what manufactures he could promote, my anſwer, and I ſpeak it from a firm conviction, would be this,—you can give us nothing, and my only requeſt on the part of Ireland is, *that you will let us alone.*

I ſpeak not of ſome few trivial articles which poſſibly, in hunting through the book of rates, might occur on paper, but they are very few if any, and of ſo little moment that they are not felt, for it would require a hunt to find them. What port in the known world can a Britiſh ſhip go to from Britain, that an Iriſh ſhip cannot go with the ſame cargo from Ireland? what article great or ſmall can a Britiſh ſhip import into Britain or Ireland, that an Iriſh ſhip cannot import equally, into Ireland or Britain? I ſpeak not of the Eaſt India ſettlements, though Ireland is as free to them as Britain is. What manufacture can Britain eſtabliſh or encourage, which Ireland is not equally free by law to do. If new ſources of trade ſhall be opened by conqueſt or by treaty, do they not belong equally, and at the ſame inſtant, to Ireland?

I aſk theſe queſtions explicitly, and defy any man to ſhew an inſtance. In point of power to trade or manufacture, ſhe can give us nothing, and ſo conſcious is he of this, that in mentioning benefits, he relies entirely on continuing to us the undiſturbed poſſeſſion of what we enjoy, as if we were to pay him with the ſacrifice of our Liberty, for his not doing us an injury.

Away then with his fine unmeaning words of a fairer and more perfect connection leading us to an equality of commercial advantages—and when he talks with ſuch a proud contumely of the dependent nature of our commercial intercourſe with Britain, as how the proſperity of our linen trade lies at the will of the Britiſh Parliament; that it reſts upon its bounty, its diſcretion, or liberality; that the advantages we have gained for the laſt fifty years are falſely attributed to the Iriſh Parliament—and ſuch ſtuff, I can hardly repreſs my indignation. Theſe humiliating aſſertions require a full anſwer, and I will give it; but let me diſtinguiſh between the Miniſter and the People of Britain. I have a ſtrong feeling of veneration for the wiſdom and liberality of the ſiſter kingdom for theſe laſt twenty years—and I will never take the Miniſter's language as ſtating her ſentiments, or thoſe of her Parliament, when it threatens us with hoſtile meaſures, if we don't ſurrender to him our Conſtitution. Her generoſity and her juſtice, as well as her prudence and true intereſt, would ſtop his hand, if he were to attempt to raiſe it in the deſperate attempt of cruſhing our proſperity. I lament he introduced the ſubject—it is not pleaſant or wiſe in private life for two friends to enter into a detail of their mutual powers of benefit and injury, to taunt with obligations, and boaſt of their means to vex and harraſs, much leſs is it ſo between nations; but he has begun, and I will go through the whole ſtate of our intercourſe.

And

And firſt as to its general ſtate, which, if I were to take from the Cuſtom-houſe books, according to their accuſtomed valuation it would appear, that

Great Britain on an average of three years to 1799, imported annually from Ireland to the value of	2,870,981*l.*
And exported to Ireland	2,775,330*l.*
Leaving a balance againſt Britain of	95,623*l.*

But fortunately an authentic paper has come to my hands; it was delivered lately to the Britiſh Parliament by Mr. Irwing, the inſpector general of the Britiſh trade. The values in it are eſtimated by the price current of the article, inſtead of the Cuſtom-houſe rate, and by the declarations of the merchants, on ſimilar goods exported to other countries under the Convoy Act.

Theſe values are ſtated to be about 70 per cent. in the groſs above the rated value.

We will not enquire why this mode was adopted now, but if the value be fairly ſtated, it certainly is better to argue for preſent expedience on the preſent real ſtate of trade than on a fictitious one, which might deceive us.

In it the ſtatement appears as follows:

Imports into Britain from Ireland for the ſame average.

	Value.	
Linen,	£2,600,101	
Raw materials, proviſions, i. e. beef, butter, pork, bacon, corn,	2,910,724	
Total,	5,510,825	
Foreign produce,	101,864	
Total import,		5,612,689

Exports

Exports from Britain to Ireland.

Britiſh manufactures,	£1,640,195	
Colonial do.	970,000	
Britiſh raw material, including coals, hops, ſalt, and bark,	447,277	
Foreign merchandize,	498,173	
	3,555,645	
Leaving an apparent balance in favour of Ireland, of		2,056,824

But on examining the nature and amount of the ſeveral articles, we ſhall find, on a compariſon of mutual benefit, that the balance is much in favour of Britain. To ſhew this, we will ſtate the trade in three points of view, as it regards manufactures, raw materials, or articles of prime neceſſity, and foreign articles.

As to the firſt, the only article of manufacture exported from Ireland to Britain is linen, and in thoſe exported to Ireland I include all Eaſt Indian and colonial produce, much of which is really manufacture, and the reſt of which may be deemed ſo, on account of the employ of labour in the colony and of the ſhipping.

It will ſtand thus:

1. Manufactures.

To Ireland,		
Manufactures of Britain,	1,640,195	2,614,000
Colonial goods,	970,000	
From Ireland, manufactures		2,600,000
Balance,		14,000

2. Raw

2. Raw Materials, &c.

Raw materials ſupplied by Ireland to Britain, including articles of prime neceſſity, as beef, butter, pork, bacon, corn, &c. &c.	2,910,724
Raw materials ſupplied by Britain to Ireland, including coals, hops, bark, ſalt, &c.	447,477
Exceſs of ſupply by Ireland,	2,463,447

3. Foreign Articles.

Foreign articles taken by Ireland from Britain,	1,468,173
Do. by Britain from Ireland,	101,864
Exceſs taken by Ireland,	1,366,309

Thus we ſee in manufactures the account is nearly equal, but in articles of neceſſity and raw material, the balance of ſupply is very great to Britain, and in the foreign articles, or carrying trade, the exceſs of gain to Britain muſt appear prodigious, if we conſider that 407,000*l.* of it only is Eaſt Indian, and of courſe 1,061,173*l.* is open to be imported direct to Ireland, were ſhe obliged or inclined to import it ſo. Sugar alone amounts to 505,000*l.* and I muſt obſerve to you, that all the Eaſt and Weſt Indian articles in this ſtatement, about 930,000*l.* are the means of Britain's remitting home ſo much of her foreign wealth, and our taking them is conſequently of great moment to her, exclufive

exclusive of her profit on the manufacturing or raising, and in the shipping, they employ.

To complete the comparison, we must add the monopoly we give to the produce of her Colonies as well in the part stated to be received from thence, as in all that we import directly, which amounts to about 140,000*l.* a year for the above average, making in the whole the produce of the British Colonies, imported directly and indirectly—660,000*l.* a year. All of which, if rash councils should ever unfortunately compel us to take them from foreign Colonies, might not only be paid for by our linens, but a very extended and beneficial market might be opened thereby.

I have detailed these statements accurately from the printed report, and you see the advantage of arriving at truth by such a detail; for if the gross amount only of these imports and exports be stated without attending to the nature of the articles, it would appear, as I before said, that the trade was greatly against Britain—whereas this statement shews us clearly that the trade is mutually beneficial, more so perhaps to Britain, but certainly so much so as to put an end to all the foolish threats which have been made, particularly as to our Linen Trade, depending wholly on British bounty and British discretion.—

I acknowledge the value of the market which Britain affords us for our linens, and I am ever willing to take every act of her's as a favour and mark of friendship; but when he asserts our linen trade depends on the British Parliament, I must examine the subject minutely.

He relies on two British measures to support him in this assertion.

1. The British Duties on the foreign linens.

2. The British Bounties on the export of Irish linens.

When

When he ſays the former were impoſed for our ſake, I muſt reply that the fact is otherwiſe, and I appeal to the Report of the Britiſh Board of Trade, in the Britiſh Journals in 1698, to which the great authority of Mr. Locke's ſignature appears: and when we are inſultingly told that we are indebted to the Britiſh Parliament for our linen manufacture, I reply, Britain is bound in every inſtance to encourage our linen trade, by compact ſo ſtrongly manifeſt in the proceedings of both Parliaments, as cannot be denied.

We gave her a valuable conſideration in putting down our woollen trade, laying 20 per cent. on its export, and in prohibiting our wool to all countries except Britain. The value of our woollen export then was, as I have ſtated 110,000*l.* (one-fifth of our whole exports.)

But to return to the Britiſh duties on foreign linens. Many petitions in the Britiſh Journals ſhew they were granted to protect the Britiſh linen manufactures and the trade of Britiſh drapers in Iriſh linens. The Scotch in thoſe petitions ſtate the linen as their ſtaple, and Mr. Dundas meaſures the wealth of Scotland by its increaſe ſince the Union.

The various Reports in the ſame Journals ſhew it is a riſing and valuable manufacture to Britain: theſe duties on foreign linen, therefore, ſo far as protection goes, are as deſirable to her as to us, and were impoſed for her protection firſt, and continued ſince for the general benefit.

As to the bounties on exports, by which he vauntingly aſſerts the Linen Trade of Ireland has been brought to its preſent height; they were not given for us, nor were they ſuggeſted by us; the Britiſh Journals ſtate them to have originated in a petition from London traders and the manufacturers of Scotland. They were granted in pre-

ference to refuſing drawbacks on the foreign linen which was the plan ſuggeſted, and in which no benefit to the Iriſh, was in contemplation; ſo far from it, the bounties extended to Iriſh linens, were confined to the property of perſons *reſiding* in Great Britain till 1780, becauſe they were intended for the benefit of the Britiſh merchant, and to prevent the direct export of linens from Ireland.

The Report of the Board of Trade, of which Lord Auckland was a member in 1780, upon the bill which I introduced here to grant ſimilar bounties on export from Ireland, affords us deciſive evidence on this head.

The Report ſays, "we ſee with ſome regret an experiment of ſimilar bounties in Ireland on Iriſh linen, tending to interrupt and hazard a great branch of the commercial intercourſe between the two countries, which has been highly and reciprocally advantageous; we are convinced too, that this new ſpeculation, ſo far as it ſucceeds, will operate to the diminution of our export trade, to the diminution alſo of the returns for that trade, and conſequently to the prejudice of our navigation, and commercial intereſts in general; but we cannot think that ſuch miſchiefs are ſuddenly to be expected to any conſiderable extent."

Again.—"We ſubmit to your Lordſhips that as far as the direct export of Linen from Ireland may take place in conſequence of the bounty propoſed there, in ſo much will our exports be affected, and the detriment reſulting to our general trade from that circumſtance will be increaſed by the returns made for exports, and by all the collateral conſequences of a proportionable transfer of our navigation and general commerce to the ports of Ireland."

In

In the ſame paper it is alſo ſtated, "That though "Great Britain carried on her Linen trade, ſubject to "great and irremovable diſadvantages, ſhe is ſuppoſed to "manufacture more linens than are exported from "Ireland."—And with regard to the bounties, "They "have been the means of forcing forward an exten-"ſive Linen Manufacture in Britain, though ſtruggling "under a great diſadvantage as to the growth and ſupply "of the raw material."

Till I brought forward the meaſure of Iriſh bounties, Britain never would let us pay bounties for them from our own ports, and ſhe was at the expence of them from her own ports to ſecure to herſelf the benefits of trading in our linens. Were a kindneſs to our manufactures the object, ſhe ſhould have let us pay them.

When their operation is boaſted of by Mr. Pitt, as having raiſed our manufacture to its preſent height, he forgets the fact—They took place in 1743, and operated, as the Report I have mentioned, ſtates, as 12 per cent. on Britiſh, and $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. only on Iriſh, the remaining $5\frac{1}{2}$ compenſating the charges of freight, commiſſion, &c. from Ireland to Britain. By this unequal encouragement, the export of Britiſh bounty linens roſe in 1763 to be equal to that of Iriſh; ſince which time the export of Britiſh has ſo increaſed over the Iriſh, that the bounties paid by Britain on her own linen in 1797, came to 82,935*l.* excluſive of a farther ſum of 56,935*l.* on linen and cotton printed, which was entirely confined to Britiſh, making all together on Britiſh, 139,970*l.* and on Iriſh to 24,459*l.* only.

Let me further tell you that they did not, at an average coſt 10,000*l.* a year from 1742 to 1771, and that this 24,459*l.* in 1797, was given on the export of about 3,000,000 yards, and this is the mighty ſum,

and this the mighty quantity, by which the linen trade of Ireland has been brought to its preſent height.

When he holds out a threat by talking of the foreign linens, and inſinuates Great Britain loſes revenue by not impoſing import duties on ours, I would tell him we know it is an idle threat, and that the Britiſh nation will never conſent to a war of Prohibitions or Duties, between the two kingdoms, the two great limbs of the ſame empire, to gratify his ſpeculations; ſhould ſuch a hoſtile meaſure ſeriouſly engage his mind, I would adviſe him to reflect, that Great Britain cannot make linens equal to her demand, that if by ſuch a meaſure the import of Iriſh were to be checked, that from Germany and Ruſſia muſt be encreaſed; and the Britiſh conſumer would pay the tax to the ſtate, and his money to a ſtranger. But ſhould it happen not to check the Iriſh—Britain who would pay the tax on them, not we, ſhould be the loſers. And if he entertains a hope to increaſe the Britiſh manufactory thereby, he will find it vain, for the capital and the hands of England are ſo fully employed by the immenſe encreaſe of demand from all the world almoſt, that there is none to ſpare; he cannot therefore turn more to linen, without withdrawing from other fabrics.

He ſeems to have got into a labyrinth on this ſubject; his miſtakes and threats are very curious; he ſays Great Britain takes from Ireland, manufactured produce, to the amount of between four and five millions, whereas even the Britiſh ſtatement at the price current makes the linen 2,600,000, and it is the only manufactured produce.

He ſays our Linen conſtitutes four-fifths of our exports to all the world; but our Iriſh books ſtate the linen not to be one half, and the Britiſh paper ſhews that what linen goes to Britain, who takes, as he ſays, ſeven-

eighths

eights of all our linen, is not one-half even of our exports to her,—if then 2,600,000*l.* the nett value of linen ſent to her is not four-fifths of 5,600,000*l.* our whole exports to her, much leſs can it be four-fifths of our exports to all the world.—When he ſays all articles eſſential to trade, to ſubſiſtence and raw materials are ſent free of duty, he forgets the fact.

Nor can I leave unnoticed his quotation from me in 1785. The language, I uſed then, did ſtate the advantages to Ireland from her ſituation and trade with Britain, and I did urge this houſe to ſecure the continuance of them. I thought a Miniſter might one day appear, who might threaten a war of duties and prohibitions, and I wiſhed to have the ſecurity of a legiſlative compact, but I never thought that that Miniſter would be the one I was then co-operating with. I was ſpeaking to Ireland only, had I been ſpeaking to England I ſhould have ſtated to them the advantages they derived from their trade with us. This was his buſineſs to do, not mine. We were working together in one cauſe to effect the meaſure of the propoſitions, and when Mr. Orde was attacked, he defended him by ſhewing the diſtinction between himſelf and Mr. Orde, "that it was neceſſary for "the latter to ſtate the advantages which would reſult "to Ireland, whereas he had only to prove they could "be given without detriment to Britain." Why does he decline to hold out the ſame ſhield for me, inſtead of the unprovoked attack which pervades ſo much of his ſpeech? But I don't aſk for his ſhield; every thing I ſaid then, I could now with perfect conſiſtence repeat. Coals, hops, bark, and rock-ſalt, are of equal value to us now as then. The whole export of articles in the nature of raw materials, at an average

of

of the three laſt years, including them, was in value 447,477*l.* ſtated at the price current. I need not repeat how inferior that whole amount is to the articles of raw materials which we ſend in return, 2,910,724*l.* in value; nor do I heſitate again to ſay that thoſe four articles are of great and eſſential conſequences to us—but I will not ſubmit to any threat on their account, and much leſs to a ſacrifice of conſtitution, which even then I refuſed to barter for trade.

Should raſh counſels, forgetting the advantages of friendly intercourſe, attempt to prohibit or clog them with duties, which no man in either country deprecates more ſincerely than I do, neceſſity may compel us to ſearch for coal, which exiſts in Ireland, but which we have never looked for effectually. It would not take many years with proper and regular application, to ſupply ourſelves with bark, nor perhaps with hops—and ſalt can be got.

Such raſh counſellors ſhould learn to dread the conſequences of changing the courſe of manufactures, by forced meaſures, and that four million and a half of people will not remain idle.

Let them reflect that England raiſed the woollen manufactory here, by prohibiting the importation of Iriſh proviſions, and ſhe eſtabliſhed the woollen manufactory afterwards in France, by deſtroying the child of her own creation in Ireland. Should ſhe attempt and prevail in prohibiting our linen to her ports, it is impoſſible to foreſee what ports we may find, what returns we may get, and in thoſe, how much of what ſhe now ſupplies us with, may be included. We know our linens beat the German, and the Ruſſian, in the American market—they are preferred even to the Scotch, and no nation can bring the fabrick to the perfection we do—not ſo much perhaps from ſuperior ſkill, as from the peculiar fitneſs of our climate

climate for bleaching, which gives a pleaſing whiteneſs and durability that no other bleached linen poſſeſſes.

We know that Spain and Portugal conſume an immenſity, not only at home, but in their extended colonies, which their fabricks don't furniſh, and which we were beginning to ſupply. In no place are we protected againſt German linen, except in Britain, and yet ours is finding its way almoſt every where.

The Britiſh duties on foreign linens are ſtated to be 33*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* per cent. Does he know when he threatens us with that duty, that at this inſtant Iriſh linens have riſen 35 per cent. above their uſual value? And yet the Britiſh merchants are ſo anxious to purchaſe them, that they are even ſecuring them on the Greens, before they can go to market. I acknowledge this is a temporary circumſtance; but it ſerves to ſhew that as far as 35*l.* is more than 33*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*; the Iriſh linens do not monopolize the Britiſh market by means of the duty, and could at preſent find their way there, even if there was no duty on the foreign. In his general aſſertions he forgets that though the Iriſh and foreign fabrics bear the general appellation of linen, much of the Iriſh is of a quality no other nation could furniſh, and no duties could make the Britiſh, who are uſed to Iriſh ſhirting, reliſh the wear of German fabrick.

But I will call Lord Grenville to my aid on this part of the ſubject, and I cannot uſe ſtronger arguments, more forcibly expreſſed. He ſaid in 1785, "If England ſhould prohibit the importation of li-"nens, the noble Lord thought Ireland would retaliate "only by prohibiting the exportation of poviſions. But "here the noble had ſurely forgot the evidence that had "been given at the bar, where it had been aſſerted, that "the raw materials of many of the great manufactures "of England were brought from Ireland.

"Should

"Should the latter then prohibit the exportation of "them, what would become of the Engliſh manufactures? "Should ſhe prohibit the exportation of woollen yarn, "how greatly would the ſtaple manufacture of this coun- "try ſuffer. Should ſhe do the ſame with reſpect to raw "hides, the different branches employed in the leather "trade of Britain would be utterly undone."

Again—"He obſerved that however fortified the noble "lord might think this country againſt any hoſtile pro- "ceedings of the Iriſh merchants, by the power which "ſhe had of prohibiting the importation of Iriſh linens, "this was no ſecurity, becauſe ſuch a prohibition would "operate as much againſt England as Ireland, and ulti- "mately more, becauſe by that means we ſhould be in- "jured in the article of our ſhipping, and loſe the carry- "ing of the Iriſh linens to the foreign markets. Nor "would this be the only bad conſequence, this car- "rying trade being thus thrown into the hands of the "Iriſh, they would thereby contract habits of inter- "courſe with the ſtates of America, and with other fo- "reign nations that would by degrees undermine us in "our trade to theſe countries."

To quit the ſubject of linens, if we look to the Britiſh trade in general, Ireland is not ſuch a cuſtomer as Britain ſhould quarrel with. In 1797, the export of her manufactures to Ireland, was - - 1,310,996*l.*
and to all the reſt of Europe - - 3,870,335*l.*
including Guernſey, Jerſey, Iſle of Man, and Greenland; ſo that the Iriſh market alone was equal to one-third of all Europe.—I ſtate the year 1797, as it is the lateſt I have ſeen the accounts of, and you will obſerve, it is from the Cuſtom-houſe value which ſerves every pur- poſe of proportion or compariſon.

It is to be lamented that Mr. Pitt has, by his threats, begun this diſcuſſion. I know that it is in the power of Britain

Britain to injure this country for a time, by a war of duties and prohibition—he need not tell us so—America affords ample proof; but she must herself suffer in the contest, and I have no fear that she will give her assent to such hostilities—her wisdom, her liberality, her own interest would forbid it.

The inferences which Mr. Pitt and I draw from the consideration of our mutual trade, are very different—I wish to shew from it, that we are of mutual use, and ought to assist each other. His arguments tend to shew he can commit hostilities in trade, he states our advantages, to threaten us with a deprivation of them. I stated them to shew our interest in maintaining them. But let us turn to the more pleasing view, where the detail of our mutual powers of trade, and of our actual state of intercourse, holds out the mutual benefits we can confer on each other, by reciprocal preference and amity. Let us look to those benefits, and protect them from the danger which this measure of a Union threatens, for I have said, and I repeat it, that it would injure our trade and manufactures, instead of serving them, and I will now prove it.

If it takes, as it must do, a great portion of the men of property to England, the manufacturers will be deprived of their best customers to the extent of what they heretofore spent. If it increases the absentees, it will reduce more estates to the miserable state of uncultivation in which theirs generally are—and it is morally certain that every member chosen to an United Parliament will be a new absentee—in county elections and popular boroughs at least, for no man, now an absentee, can expect to be chosen—and that every member must be a man of considerable property, is equally probable, because no other could bear the expence of parliamentary attendance.

But this is not all—the articles of Union propoſe a poſſible period at which the duties that at preſent afford a ſort of protection to the manufacturer, are to ceaſe. Is there no danger then that the further expenditure of money may ceaſe immediately, that individuals will look to winding up their buſineſs, in order to withdraw their capital againſt that period—for all idea of permanency of protection being done away, its effect becomes temporary and unavailing.

Again—our import duties on ſome raw materials, are fitted to our infant ſtate. Iron we import at 12*s.* 6*d.*—Britain imports it at near 3*l.* Every man concerned in the iron manufacture here, muſt expect the United Parliament will put theſe duties on a level.

They may expect the ſame as to raw ſilk for which we pay, on import about one half the duty they pay.

Further, the farmers, whoſe ſpirits we have raiſed by our corn laws, muſt look with uncertainty to the continuation of the bounties they afford—and expect the principles on which thoſe bounties were diſcontinued from one part of the kingdom to another, and from the whole of it to Dublin, will be extended on a ſimilar reaſoning by the United Parliament to the whole of the United Empire.

But the evils will extend ſtill further—What ſecurity will the nation feel in any thing, when it loſes the protection of its Parliament—whoſe competence to ſupport and protect them, they have found effectual proof of, on all occaſions.

Every law, every regulation which you now value and rely on, will be ſubject to repeal, not by a Parliament whoſe knowledge and attachment you can confide in, but by a foreign one, to which acceſs will be difficult, communication expenſive, and who cannot know the local grounds which gave riſe to them.

Few

Few mercantile men will be able to repreſent you in an United Parliament, their buſineſs wont allow them to go out of the kingdom for eight months, though they could with eaſe attend in Dublin from any part of Ireland; neither can you avail yourſelves of the conſtitutional knowledge of lawyers, for they muſt give up their profeſſion to go there, and you will all agree that in the preſent queſtion they have ſtood forward nobly.

New laws equal in appearance and in phraſe, may be very unequal in effect, to countries differently ſituated. I will inſtance taxation laws.—Ireland is a young country, riſing and likely to riſe in wealth; it is her beſt plan to borrow money, inſtead of raiſing an annual income to bear the war expences, becauſe the certain proſpect of her encreaſing proſperity gives a moral certainty of her paying the debt gradually, and an encreaſe of annual taxes to the neceſſary arrears, might curb her enterpriſe. Britain is at maturity; the ſtate of warfare has thrown the trade of the world into her hands, and there is no reaſon to expect it will encreaſe upon a peace; perhaps the ſpeculation of its decreaſe might not be chimerical; ſhe therefore ſhould take advantage of her temporary affluence, and by annual taxes, not by borrowing, make it ſupport the yearly expences of the war: a ſyſtem, therefore, of taxation for the whole expences of the year, though equal in appearance, would be very unequal in effect.

A further diſcouragement muſt ariſe from the people feeling that their proſperity and happineſs will be given back again to the controul of a Britiſh Parliament whoſe partial conduct againſt this country, until the conſtitution of 1782 gave freedom to our Parliament, and with it the power of protection, Mr. Pitt has deſcribed in language ſo particularly forcible that I will read it to you, "he bids the com-

" mittee recollect, that from the revolution, to a pe-
" riod within the memory of every man who heard
" him, indeed until theſe very few years, the ſyſtem
" had been that of debarring Ireland from the enjoy-
" ment and uſe of her own reſources, to make the
" kingdom completely ſubſervient to the intereſts and
" opulence of this country, without ſuffering her to
" ſhare in the bountles of nature, in the induſtry of
" her citizens, or making them contribute to the gene-
" ral intereſts and ſtrength of the empire, this ſyſtem
" of cruel and abominable reſtraint had however been
" exploded. It was at once harſh and unjuſt, and it
" was as impolitic as it was oppreſſive; for however
" neceſſary it might be to the partial benefit of diſtricts
" in Britain, is promoted not the real ſtrength of the
" Empire. That which had been the ſyſtem counter-
" acted the kindneſs of providehce, and ſuſpended the
" induſtry and enterpriſe of man. Ireland was put
" under ſuch reſtraint, that ſhe was ſhut out from every
" ſpecies of commerce. She was reſtrained from send-
" ing the produce of her own ſoil to foreign markets,
" and all correſpondence with the colonies of Britain
" was prohibited to her, ſo that ſhe could not derive
" their commodities but through the medium of Britain,
" this was the ſyſtem which had prevailed, and this was
" the ſtate of thraldom in which that country had been
" kept ever ſince the revolution."

Again—" Ireland had for a long ſeries of time felt the
" narrow policy of Britain, who, influenced by views of
" trade and commercial advantages, and tainted and per-
" verted with ſelfiſh motives, had treated her with partia-
" lity and neglect, and never looked upon her growth
" and proſperity, as the growth and proſperity of the
" empire at large."

Mr.

Mr. Grenville's expreſſions too are ſtrong:

"If England was heavily taxed, ſhe had now, and "had had the benefit for a whole century paſt of a "widely extended trade, from which ſhe had excluded "Ireland—and the latter had already given to England "all that ſhe would have made, if by a barbarous and "equally abſurd policy ſhe had not been debarred from "thoſe advantages that God and Nature had given her."

If any man ſays that this Union does not bring us back under the controul of the Britiſh Parliament, becauſe we ſhall have the mockery of 100 repreſentatives to ſit among 558—I anſwer, it is a mere impoſition, a play on words. Is there a man can doubt that 100 muſt yield to 558, and that our ſending ſuch a ſhadow of repreſentation, will only give legal form to the power of the 558 to tax us; How can their feeble voices be heard, if the others chooſe not to liſten; but if you want proof, Scotland affords it; tradition ſays, all her repreſentatives joined in a motion to diſſolve the Union, and they were overcome.—Virtually, and to every practical effect, therefore, this projected Union will put as back again even into a worſe ſtate of dependance than we were in before 1782, into that miſerable, abject ſituation which, in Mr. Pitt's words, "counteracted the kindneſs of Providence, and ſuſpend-"ed the induſtry and enterpriſe of man, which debarred "us of thoſe advantages that God and Nature gave us," with this difference, that we ſhould then be legally bound by our own act which we could not get rid of, whereas before 1782 we never acknowledged the old uſurpation, and we had a Parliament which reſcued us from it.

Perhaps you would depend on the articles you may frame to ſecure your trade and your purſe; but you muſt recollect, that if the doctrine of the omnipotence of Parliament be juſt (and it has ſtrong advocates),

it

it will extend to the United Parliament, who will have the power therefore at it's pleaſure to alter any act of the Union itſelf—and you muſt ſee, that as no article, ſo neither will the whole of the Union exiſt longer than while it is beneficial to Great Britain; but it will exiſt for ever though Ireland find it injurious to her intereſt, the power of extinction reſting in a Parliament compoſed of 558 Britiſh and 100 Iriſh members—and even ſhould the Union ceaſe to exiſt, are you ſure that you can or will be reſtored to the free and independent legiſlature which you are now called on to abandon.

Obſerve alſo, as I before ſtated, that the diſavowal of the compact of 1782 muſt create a ſuſpicion that any compact made in 1799 may be treated as lightly.

But look to Scotland, we ſhall there ſee that time and circumſtances have ſet aſide the great beneficial difference in taxation which induced that kingdom to conſent to Union. Her lands were to pay only about one-fortieth part, or rather leſs, of the Britiſh land tax, but by annihilating the meaſure of a land tax, another is raiſed by the name of an income tax; that is, *inſtead of taxing the land, the income ariſing out of that land is taxed*, and eſtimating Scotland in her income at one-eighth of England, as Mr. Pitt has done, her lands will pay henceforward one-eighth inſtead of one-fortieth of what thoſe of England do. I am far from inſinuating that this meaſure is a breach of any article in the Scotch Union, or that it was intended even to evade it; on the contrary, I mention it to ſhew how futile any language in which articles of Union can be expreſſed, may be rendered by the accidents of time and unforeſeen circumſtances, and that the effect is the ſame to the Scotchman as if the articles of Union were broken.

If I aſked what ſecurity will the nation have when it loſes the protection of its Parliament, of whoſe competence to protect, effectual proof has been given?

the

the obvious anſwer would be, that all ſecurity will be annihilated, when we loſe our own, which is both competent and effectual—it and not the Britiſh Parliament has raiſed our ſtaple trade to its preſent great height.

It gave the export bounties which beſides the benefit of navigation, has put our linen trade on equal footing with the Britiſh, whereas till then our linen was exported from Britain, as the Lords of the Council have ſtated, under a diadvantage of 5¼ per cent.

Recollect when the Executive was unable to procure for you, the full participation of the Metheuen treaty with Portugal, and lamented the delay; your Parliament ſtepped in, and by its vigour and deciſion compelled Portugal to ſubmit to your juſt claims.

Recollect, when during forty years your victualling trade had been haraſſed and reſtricted by 24 embargoes, one of which laſted three years, where did you find relief? Your Parliament took up the ſubject, the embargo ceaſed, and none has appeared to oppreſs you from that day. Your Parliament gave you bounties to promote your agriculture, which have maintained and enriched you ever ſince; it gave you the octennial bill which firſt infuſed the ſpirit that animated its exertions to demand and obtain for you a free trade and a free conſtitution, the ever ſacred and proſperous conſtitution of 1782.

After theſe incontrovertible proofs that the Union muſt injure Ireland: were I to ſelect the place in the kingdom which is leaſt capable of receiving benefit, and moſt capable of ſuffering injury by a Union, it is Cork and the country around it.

The only manufactures in which any ſucceſsful attempts have been made in or near Cork, and thoſe not extenſive, are the woollen and the cotton; but I have ſhewn you that no manufacture of woollen or cotton

can

can be promoted any where in Ireland by the meaſure. And I have ſhewn you too, that a Union can no way increaſe the powers or capabilities of export or import. In nufacture therefore, or in import or export, the Union offers nothing to Cork—and that Cork cannot be an emporium or depot for ſtoring foreign goods, Mr. Pitt has ſhewn clearly, in the quotations I have made from him, wherein he expoſes the folly of Ireland's entertaining ſuch a hope.

In theſe reſpects, then, a Union offers nothing; but perhaps ſome may repreſent to themſelves that the eſtabliſhment of a naval dock-yard would be the conſequence? In return, I aſk, What could induce the eſtabliſhment of a dock-yard after a Union more than before? or, What has hitherto prevented it, but that it did not appear to be a uſeful or deſirable ſituation? However, ſuppoſe they perſevere, if they look at Plymouth, Portſmouth, &c. the latter, one of the beſt ſituations in Britain for commerce, they will ſee that no trade exiſts where thoſe great naval dock-yards are eſtabliſhed; and if they look at Milford-Haven in Wales, a glorious harbour, yet as a place of naval reſort, much abandoned, they will find, I believe, that any trade which it may have formerly enjoyed, has not returned to it. Let them look at Scotland, has the Union in the courſe of a century cauſed a navy dock-yard to be eſtabliſhed there? What hope, then, can Cork entertain? Its ſituation was always the ſame it is now; and the fact muſt be, that it is no deſirable one for the purpoſe, or the great attention of the various ſucceſſive Miniſters of Britain to the naval ſtrength of the empire, would long ſince have taken advantage of it.

I would bid the people of Cork recollect that their two great and enriching articles of export, corn, and proviſions may be deeply endangered by the Union. Their corn trade has encreaſed the agriculture in that province

to

to a great extent; ſhould the alteration of bounties follow the meaſure, which I have ſtated rational grounds for apprehending, they will loſe not only the internal benefits which agriculture has lately begun to let them taſte the bleſſings of, but with them all the advantages of the corn trade. Nay more, there is a further value to them in agriculture, from the turn that has taken place, and is likely to encreaſe in the demand for proviſions; I mean the preference that is given to pork over beef. Pork depends on agriculture; and thoſe gentlemen of Cork who export proviſions, lately experienced as I believe, the truth of this aſſertion; for, if I am not miſ-informed, the demand for Iriſh pork was much leſſened by the ſtoppage of the diſtilleries in Britain having induced the farmers there to fatten pork; nor did the demand return to its uſual courſe here till the diſtilleries were allowed to work again; therefore if agriculture decreaſes, they may bid farewell to the pork trade, which will go along with it.

Let Cork advert to the other branch of their proviſion trade, beef. I have already mentioned Embargoes; and it is in the recollection of many merchants there, how often their intereſts uſed to be ſacrificed to the advantage or avarice of Britiſh contractors, and how the trade was almoſt annihilated by the continuance of one embargo for three years, they know how vain were all their applications for redreſs until the Parliament, which they are now invited to extinguiſh and baniſh from the land, took up their cauſe and by it's bare interference, not only put an end to it, but has prevented the renewal of any ſuch injuſtice ſince. Let even thoſe who don't agree with me in theſe apprehenſions, conſider that it is poſſible they may not be altogether ill-founded; let the people of Cork ſee that no temptation is held out by the Union to induce them even to hazard the

poſſibility of danger, that they are thriving rapidly, and ſafety adviſes them to reſt content and not to try experiments, and more particularly ſuch as will be without remedy if they prove injurious.

I have often mentioned and reminded you, of the proſperous and riſing ſtate of this kingdom; you all muſt know it, but I will not reſt the fact as my own aſſertion. I will give you an authority, you muſt acknowledge your own unanimous addreſs in July laſt to the preſent viceroy, wherein you ſay, 'that under his Majeſty's benevolent auſpices his 'kingdom of Ireland had riſen to a heighth of proſperity un-'hoped for, and unparalleled in any former era; that our 'commerce had been largely extended, our Conſtitution 'highly improved, and every claſs of ſubjects conciliated by 'the moſt liberal acts of conceſſion and indulgence.'

Are you going to give up that Conſtitution almoſt at the moment you have declared it highly improved.—Do you want to be better than well? Take caution from the hiſtory of that fooliſh man who was well, would be better, took phyſic, and died.

But we are triumphantly told of the example of Scotland, and the great advantages ſhe has derived from the Union; I ſay there is no ſimilarity in our ſituation and hers; ſhe was connected with England only by the accidental circumſtance of the Crown of England having deſcended to her monarch, in all other reſpects ſhe was as foreign as Hanover to England.

By this junction of the crowns ſhe loſt the reſidence of her monarch, and became ſubject to foreign influence in all her national concerns; depreſſed in her trade, in every thing

thing of value to her ſtate, ſhe was gradually declining as a nation from that period.

Scotland had no conſtitution like Britain—her two houſes ſat together, and the repreſentatives of the people did not hold the purſe of the nation—her king by his power of creating peers could at any day overpower the voices of the Commons by numbers, juſt as the 558 Britiſh members could overpower our pitiful 100 delegates—her parliament even with this imperfect conſtitution had not a deliberative power; it could diſcuſs no ſubject but what was previouſly prepared by the Lords of the Articles, ſomewhat as ours was limited by Poyning's Act to whatever the Privy Council ſhould think proper to point out. Moreover the two kingdoms had no affection, but much national diſlike and prejudice towards each other, they never had been good neighbours, and the Scotch feelings had been particularly rouſed by many recent circumſtances; ſhe was the only maritime ſtate without ſettlement or trade beyond Europe, and therefore had made a great effort in 1696, to eſtabliſh a colony at Darien, and formed a company by Act of Parliament and Royal Charter for trading to Aſia, Africa, and the Indies. The Parliament of England took alarm and addreſſed the King, and the company was broke in 1699, by the interference of Britain getting the ſubſcriptions at Amſterdam, Hamburgh and elſewhere withdrawn; by prohibiting the American colonies from holding any correſpondence with the Scotch, who had actually made the ſettlement, and by encouraging the Spaniards to attack it: the unfortunate colony was of courſe ſoon deſtroyed,—and the Scotch Nation ſaw with mortification many of their nobles ſlaughtered at Darien, 400,000l. of property deſtroyed and their hope of an extenſive foreign trade annihilated. It is no wonder ſuch proceedings ſhould hurt

their

their feelings towards England, and the utter demolition of this Darien company, though encouraged by their King at firſt, ſhewed them their own deſperate ſituation and the predominant and injurious effects of Engliſh power; thoſe feelings ſtill encreaſed until they broke out in 1704 by their paſſing an Act of Security whereby England and Scotland were to be legally disjoined ſo ſoon as Queen Anne ſhould die; this Act ordered Fencible troops to be raiſed, armed and trained.—They alſo paſſed an Act for the export of their wool to France which was then at war with England.

This conduct was followed on the part of England by ſeverity and intimidation; an Act appointing commiſſioners for a Union was paſſed, it enacted the Scotch to be aliens, forbidding arms and ammunition to be exported into Scotland, and prohibiting the import of their cattle, which were five-ſixths of their whole export, and the import of their linen and their coals, until they ſhould ſettle the crown as Britain had.

Their trade had been lucrative with France and Holland—the Engliſh admiralty ordered cruiſers to ſeize their ſhips—the lords addreſſed for troops to be ſent to the Frontiers—hoſtilities were on the point of commencing and they had no means of prevention; being no part of the Britiſh Empire; they muſt ſee that the becoming a part would be a ſure remedy---devoid of a conſtitution worth preſerving, they might ſee a glorious acquiſition in obtaining the Britiſh, in ſhort they might ſee that in a Union they would obtain what they never before had enjoyed, a free conſtitution, and with it an equal adminiſtration of juſtice, which alſo they had been deprived of in ſome degree by their Privy Council.

They

They had every diſadvantage of an unequal and very imperfect connexion with a powerful and a jealous rival, they had much to gain and little to loſe, their ſituation at the time alſo rendered them ſucceptible of peculiar benefits—low in manufacture, cramped in trade, they muſt ſee happineſs in an offer of being incorporated with a nation rich in trade and manufacture.—Scotland could not long heſitate to accept a ſhare in all the benefits of a great and encreaſing commerce, not one atom of which ſhe could otherwiſe enjoy. Nature too ſeemed to point out to the inhabitants of the ſame iſland, to ceaſe their mutual jarrs and become one people, and if Munſter was a diſtinct kingdom in this iſland, ſituated as Scotland was, I ſhould be a ſtrong advocate for Munſter's uniting with the reſt of the iſland. But look at our ſituation,—a conſtituent part of the empire, we enjoy all its various branches of trade, and have a right to and receive its protection; ſeparated by nature by the Iriſh channel, the two kingdoms have not been ſubject to the incurſions, and deadly hates and animoſities which diſtracted Scotland and England—we are not only united to the crown, but to the empire inſeparably, our friends, our enemies always the ſame, and our intereſts as well as our laws binding us in that Union.—We have long enjoyed a free Conſtitution, we have it as free and as much calculated for happineſs, for ſecurity, and for every bleſſing of ſociety as any nation upon earth, equally of as England.—With this, with every power of trade, with every port in the univerſe that is open to England, open likewiſe to us, we have nothing to gain and we have much to loſe,—we have to loſe, that Conſtitution under which we have thriven ſince its Final Adjuſtment in 1782, and which has raiſed us into manufactures, trade, affluence, and ſtation among the nations of the earth.

In

In preſerving this Conſtitution we retain all the means of trade, through all the various channels of wealth, as open now to us as to Britain, whereas if we ſacrifice it to the nonſenſical project in queſtion, wealth will vaniſh when freedom is baniſhed, and we have more to loſe than mere wealth or trade; we have that to loſe for which Engliſhmen in every age have fought and bled; for which our anceſtors gloriouſly perſevered in battle; and for the preſervation of which the Britiſh Empire is now engaged in the moſt arduous war,—Liberty, not as inculcated by modern political traitors, but ſound genuine conſtitutional Liberty.

I have now proved the different ſituation of the two kingdoms, and that there is no ſimilarity between that of Ireland in 1799 and that of Scotland in 1706, and I might diſmiſs the ſubject, but I will for a moment admit the compariſon, to ſhew you that every argument drawn from it, ſtrongly urges us againſt a ſimilar experiment. The argument is ſhallow, which attributes every increaſe of trade, of population, of wealth in Scotland from that day to this, to the Union, as if nothing was due to the progreſſive ſtate of the world during a century, and Scotland alone amidſt ſurrounding nations was to have remained ſtationary; if ſuch was the vicioufneſs of her Conſtitution, the miſeries of her ſituation or the depreſſion of her reſources; well might ſhe have accepted any terms.

But has Scotland advanced in proſperity ſince the Union as much as Ireland? Mr. Dundas her great advocate, ſtates the progreſs of her linen manufacture, to ſhew her increaſe of proſperity, it was one million of yards in 1706, and in 1796, 23 millions. How does the linen manufacture of Ireland ſtand the compariſon?

Its

		Yards.	*Value.*
Its export was in	1706	530,838	22,750
	1783	16,039,705	1,069,313
	1796	46,705,319	3,113,687

that is 88 times greater, as to quantity, and 137 times greater as to value in 1796 than in 1700, and thus that manufacture which is the ſtaple of both kingdoms, and which Mr. Dundas very properly brought forward to reſt his arguments on, roſe from 1 to 88 in Ireland, in ſeparate and ununited, Ireland, under the nurture and protection of Ireland's Parliament, while during the ſame period it roſe in united Scotland without a reſident Parliament from 1 to 23 only. Has Mr. Dundas any more ſuch arguments to produce?

He and Mr. Pitt ſeem conſcious they have little to urge by holding Scotland to us as an example, for they both ſtate one ſolitary inſtance of Glaſgow's riſe, and yet as I am informed, that very town has decreaſed in its trade ever ſince the American war.

But why don't they rely on the encreaſed population of Scotland as well as on its trade, it was 1 million, at the Union, and Mr. Pitt ſays it is a million and a half now, but Ireland had little above 1½ million of inhabitants at the ſame time, and has near 4½ now. If population be a deſirable object, if it be riches to a ſtate, and the means of encreaſing the empire's ſtrength, Ireland has encreaſed three fold without a Union, and Scotland only one half with it.

Why don't he refer to their agriculture, which is peculiarly applicable to the queſtion, becauſe its riſe began in Ireland with the Conſtitution of 1782, which the Miniſter now wants to annihilate? it has riſen ſince that period to the value of full a million yearly, including the decreaſe or rather ſtop-

page

page of import, the immenſe acceſſion of home demand, and the encreaſing export; even ſo much as to ſupply largely every year, this affluent kingdom whoſe proſperity we are deſired to imitate, and who cannot maintain itſelf.

And why does not Mr. Dundas who compliments me by ſaying I deſcended to create an alarm on the ſtaple manufacture of Ireland, which is the great manufacture of the country I repreſent,—why does not he deſcend to tell us the opinion of his country-man, Mr. Adam Smith on the beneficial operations of the Scotch Union.—Did it promote trade or manufacture in Smith's opinion? No. His words are in 1775, 'of all commercial advantages which Scotland has derived 'from the Union, the riſe in the price of cattle is perhaps the 'greateſt.' The live cattle on which we have laid duties to check their export. And again, 'the price of wool was re-'duced by the Union, excluding it from the great markets 'of Europe, and confining it to the narrow one of England.'

If Ireland then ſtands the compariſon with united Scotland, let us try how ſhe ſtands even with united Britain.

		Value.
The exports of Ireland were in	1706	548,318
	1783	2,935,067
	1796	5,064,834
The exports from Britain in	1706	6,512,086
	1708	6,969,089
	1796	27,621,843

In Ireland the exports roſe nearly from one to ten, and in Britain from the year after the Union, (which I have choſen for fair compariſon, as it includes the Scotch trade,) from 1 to 3 and a fraction,—the Iriſh is almoſt ten times as great as it was in 1706, the Britiſh not 4 times.

I take

I take the year 1796, becauſe Mr. Dundas ſelected it, and you will obſerve in the Iriſh ſtatements that the exports of 1783 are marked, that you may compare them with with 1796 and ſee the great ſpring which the free Conſtitution has give to trade and manufacture. The general export roſe in 78 years to 1782 from 1 to 5, and in 14 years after 1782 from 5 to 10. The linen export in the 78 years roſe from 1 to 32, and in the laſt 14, from 32 to 88: ſo that the general export roſe as much in the laſt 14 years, as it had done, not only during the preceding 78 years, but during all time preceding; and the linen encreaſed in the laſt 14 years very nearly to treble the amount of what it had been before.

And will you part with the Conſtitution of 1782? No!—If the whole of this compariſon ſays any thing, it cries out in emphatic terms to all Ireland, to every honeſt Iriſhman—NO UNION!!!—Reject the offer, and adhere to the Conſtitution of 1782; the immenſe value of which, every argument advanced for the Union, every enquiry into the ſtate of things ſince, points out to you in every circumſtance.

To conclude this part of the ſubject. The queſtion between England and Scotland was, Union or total Separation, immediately on the demiſe of the Crown. The queſtion between us, is, the Miniſter's project, or the Conſtitution of 1782; the Union we poſſeſs, which guards us againſt Separation, and works well in practice, or a new one, at the expence of our liberty, our tranquillity, and our happineſs, which, in its very terms, leads to Separation. Seton, whom Mr. Dundas quotes at length, recommended the Union of Scotland to prevent Separation:—we oppoſe the propoſed Union from the ſame motive.

I now proceed to a ſubject which I wiſh had never been mentioned—the competence of Parliament; it is dangerous in a popular aſſembly to ſtate, that there are points where the powers of the legiſlature end and thoſe of the people at large begin; ſuch points are incapable of definition, and the aſſertion is capable of very dangerous miſinterpretation.—I am happy therefore it is no way neceſſary to go into it, let me only remark this: whatever may or may not be its competence, the doctrine of the omnipotence of Parliament which ſome Gentlemen have advanced, certainly goes too far, and much farther than they are aware of, for it argues againſt the permanency of the very Union it is advanced to promote. Is it not evident, that the united Parliament muſt be as omnipotent as the ſeparate Parliaments, and may therefore break any article of the Union at its pleaſure; and if this omnipotence can conſolidate two ſeparate Legiſlatures, it may equally conſolidate the two ſeparate Houſes, or the three eſtates of each, and then take from the Commons the Conſtitutional power over the purſe of the nation, and give it to the King, as was the caſe virtually in Scotland, prior to the Union.

It may, with the ſame power that it removes the Iriſh Parliament out of the realm of Ireland, remove the Britiſh Parliament out of the realm of Britain, to Jerſey, Guernſey, the Weſt Indies, or the Iſle of Man: in the ſame courſe of reaſoning, it may put down any branch of the Conſtitution, and juſtify the uſurpation of Cromwell. An argument which proves too much, proves nothing. I wiſh it never had been mentioned, it makes an unneceſſary waſte of time; for if I have ſhewn you, that our ſtation in the Britiſh Empire reſts on a firm baſis, that our connexion with Great Britain is ſolid to every practical purpoſe, that it does not hang by a thread, but is rivetted on the intereſts, the ſentiments, and affections

tions of both nations; and that thoſe rivets are cloſed and kept firm by the regulations of 1782. That the Union thus conſolidated, is the moſt ſtrong and effectual, which human wiſdom could form between two kingdoms, ſituated as Great Britain and Ireland are: that every imperial concern has ever ſince been arranged as ſoon as known: that the Conſtitution then eſtabliſhed has not only worked well, (to uſe a modern phraſe) to promote the ſtrength and energy of the Empire, but to raiſe this kingdom into proſperity, and keep it in a ſteady and rapid advance even beyond the utmoſt hopes of its warmeſt advocates; if, not only no neceſſity for the innovation has been proved, but the only real and avowed argument turns out to be, a deſire to take from you the power of taxation, and veſt it in Britain. If no trade, no manufactures, no capital, has been or can be given to you by the meaſure; but on the contrary, all you enjoy will be rendered inſecure: if it encreaſss your abſentees, draws away the property, the talents, and the induſtry of the country; if it damps all enterprize, and degrades a great and riſing kingdom into an abject and depreſſed colony; if no means of tranquility or ſecurity againſt the enemy is to be its reſult, but diſcontent and danger is to ariſe from it: if it tends to diſunite the affections, and to create jealouſy between the two great members of the Empire, who are now firmly, happily, and cordially united: if the example of Scotland, which is held out to you as a temptation, affords no one inducement, but as far as any argument can be drawn from it, warns you loudly againſt the meaſure, in ſhort, if your own Parliament is competent, and more effectual than any other, to every work of Legiſlation or Parliamentary exertion, for all the particular concerns of Ireland, and for every Imperial purpoſe, it is needleſs to enquire into its power, or its competence, as to an object, in which it can have no one inducement to exerciſe

power

power, and every poſſible motive to decline it; it is wiſer to look to its competence to do good, to protect and ſupport the country. Store up in your minds then, the words of Lord Camden laſt May 'that the wiſdom, the firmneſs and 'ſpirit manifeſted by the Houſe of Commons during the 'whole of that eventful period, and their peculiar promp-'titude, alacrity, and unanimity, muſt tend in the moſt 'effectual manner to cruſh rebellion and ſave the ſtate,' and again, 'the promptitude and ſpirit of the Houſe of Com-'mons muſt ever be remembered with gratitude by the 'country and myſelf, they have enabled me to develope 'and expoſe the deepeſt conſpiracy that ever exiſted, and 'to place the kingdom in a ſtate to meet the efforts of a 'foreign as well as a domeſtic enemy.' Remember the thanks of his Majeſty to you by your preſent viceroy in October laſt, 'for the unſhaken firmneſs and magnani-'mity, with which you met the many trying difficulties; 'and with which the meaſures were planned, which you 'adopted for the preſervation of your country.' Be it your pride to be competent to ſuch glorious exertions.

It is needleſs to enter into the details of a meaſure, the principle of which, I truſt, will never be entertained: one thing only I will remark, that if the purity of Parliament depends on the purity of election—if that purity reſts on Mr. Grenville's law for controverted election, which no man can deny, his law muſt be inoperative to Ireland in a united Parliament, and of courſe you cannot preſerve the purity of election or of Parliament, ſo far as that law is concerned. You all know the number of witneſſes to be examined on an election trial; the many whoſe evidence occur during the very trial to be neceſſary, and the great delay and heavy expence attending the whole. How then could you have ſuch a trial in London? The ex-

pence

pence alone would be ſo formidable, that few, very few would be capable, and fewer willing to undertake a petition: the Sheriff would virtually enjoy the power of nomination, and if ever Government, in its zeal for the public ſervice, ſhould happen to think it right to appoint Sheriffs with a view to elections (I do not ſay they ever do) the nomination of the Members would finally reſt with that government.

I have gone through every argument, or aſſertion, that any of the Britiſh or Iriſh advocates for this fatal meaſure have advanced, except one, which regards the ſtate of Religion in this kingdom, it is too delicate a ſubject to diſcuſs unneceſſarily, and I cannot but condemn the imprudence which has brought it forward now, as if the object were by rouſing animoſities, and ſetting the nation by the ears, to make any change even that of ſurrendering its liberty and independance, worth conſideration, if not worth trial. I will only obſerve on it, that Mr. Pitt's language is of ſuch a nature, that one would imagine he had the two religions on either ſide of him, and one was not to hear what he ſaid to the other. He tells the Catholic in his ſpeech, that it is not eaſy to ſay, what ſhould be the church eſtabliſhment in this kingdom, and his 5th reſolution ſtates that the preſent church eſtabliſhment is to be preſerved. He tells them, that the time for diſcuſſing their ſituation muſt depend on two points, 'when their conduct ſhall make it ſafe, and when the temper of the times ſhall be favourable,' and Mr. Dundas adds, 'if ever ſuch a time ſhall come.' Let me aſk you, in common ſenſe, is an Iriſh Parliament incompetent to decide theſe points, to deliberate, to judge on matters which paſs in Ireland: and is a foreign and uninformed aſſembly adequate to it? It is a weak and ſilly impoſition.

Were

Were I to addreſs the Catholics, the Proteſtants, and all religions, I would ſay, your Country is in danger, a deſperate attempt is on foot to ſeduce you to ſurrender the independence of your Parliament. You are all natives of the ſame iſland, intereſted in its trade, its proſperity, its freedom, and in all the bleſſings of a glorious and happy conſtitution—bound by every tie of duty to yourſelves, your country, and your poſterity, to preſeve it, join all hands and hearts together, bring the veſſel into port, forget all family differences, all local or partial jealouſies, and ſave Ireland, ſave your country. Tell the bold miniſter who wants to take away your Conſtitution, that he ſhall not have it, that you will not be his dupes; that you love Britain as a brother, but you will be his brother not his dependant, that you will not degrade yourſelves from an independant kingdom into an abject colony.

To any of you who have doubts on the meaſure, I would ſay, theſe very doubts call on you to vote againſt it—don't hazard a change where you have a doubt, a change from whence there is no return—accept it, you have it for better for worſe, you never can untie the knot—no appeal, no Parliament left, to hear, to argue, or to ſpeak for you; and if the ſtep you take ſhould prove wrong, if it ſhould unfortunately end in the nation's calling for her old Conſtitution again, and the politics of a Britiſh Cabinet ſhould be ſo deſperate as not to liſten to that call, think of the dreadful conſequences you may be the cauſe of, if fatally the ſhock of arms ſhould follow. Even to you whoſe conviction is clear, I would ſay, if the majority of your countrymen think differently from you, if even a reſpectable part of them only think ſo, don't reſt ſo confidently on your own judgments, as to riſk a meaſure which you cannot undo; remember then if the direful neceſſity ſhould ever arrive to make it expedient—you may embrace

it

it when you pleaſe, but if once adopted, it is irrevocable. —Were I ſpeaking in another aſſembly, and if in ſuch aſſembly any member ſat returned for a borough, where the wiſhes of the electors followed the voice of ſome one individual by which he became to have an habitual ſuperiority, and of courſe a ſtrong intereſt in its preſervation, (I don't ſay ſuch a caſe exiſts here, though it might not be unparliamentary to ſuppoſe it.) I would tell him, he is a truſtee, and without poſitive and direct deſire, he ſhould not do an act which is to annihilate the intereſt he is entruſted with.—No, no—let all join in cheriſhing the Parliament—it is a good one, and has done its duty—it has proved itſelf competent to every purpoſe of legiſlation, to ſecure peace, to put down rebellion, and had its vigour been followed up ſince laſt June, peace would have been ſince ſecured, and rebellion extinguiſhed.—Refuſe the meaſure, but refuſe it with calmneſs and dignity.—Let not the offer of it leſſen your attachment or weaken your affections to Britain, and prove that you are, and wiſh to be, as the Duke of Portland told you you were, *indiſſolubly connected with Great Britain, one in unity of conſtitution and unity of intereſt.*—But above all, revere and ſteadily preſerve that Conſtitution which was confirmed to you under his adminiſtration in 1782, and which has given you Wealth, Trade, Proſperity, Freedom and Independence.

FINIS.

17
83
SEP